

402. By Mr. CELLER: Petition of the Peelle Co., William Spykehoven, and another citizen of Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing bonus legislation and favoring the reduction of taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

403. Also, petition of Fire, Marine & Liability Brokers' Association of the City of New York and Sidney Blumenthal & Co. (Inc.), of New York City, favoring Mellon's tax-reduction plan and opposing the enactment of bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

404. Also, petition of the Merchants Association of New York, Morgan, French & Co. (Inc.), and American Paper & Pulp Co., of New York City, N. Y., urging the passage of tax bill and opposing the enactment into legislation of a soldiers' bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

405. Also, petition of the Delaware & Hudson Co., New York City, N. Y., approving tax-reduction plan and opposing the passage of a bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

406. Also, petition of Chas. M. Higgins & Co. and L. R. Pratt, of Brooklyn, N. Y., approving the tax-reduction plan and opposing the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

407. Also, petition of the James J. Matchett Co. and the John Levy Galleries, New York City, N. Y., favoring tax reduction and opposing bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

408. Also, petition of committee of employees of the Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York, favoring the tax bill and opposing bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

409. Also, petition of officers and employees of the Titus Blatter & Co., New York City, N. Y., favoring the passage of the tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

410. Also, petition of J. G. Taylor, Massena, N. Y., urging Congress to reduce taxes and oppose the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

411. Also, petition of United Real Estate Owners' Association, New York City, N. Y., urging reduction of taxes by Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

412. Also, petition of Fred G. Wolf, New York City, N. Y., favoring reduction of taxes and opposing bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

413. Also, petition of F. O. Cedar Works (Ltd.), New York City, N. Y., favoring Secretary Mellon's tax-reduction plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

414. Also, petition of Diamond Saw & Stamping Works, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the reduction of taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

415. Also, petition of the Beckwith-Chandler Co., Newark, N. J., favoring tax reduction and opposing the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

416. Also, petition of John Hood and R. Whitel, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., favoring tax reduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

417. Also, petition of Southern Metal Trade Association, Atlanta, Ga., favoring tax reduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

418. By Mr. FAUST: Petition of rural carriers of Cass County, Mo., favoring passage of maintenance bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

419. By Mr. FAVROT: Petition of A. B. Moore and other citizens of Baton Rouge, La., favoring a reduction of taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

420. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Cross, Roy & Saunders, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the Morgan bill (H. R. 91) repealing the tax on telegraph and telephone messages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

421. Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring reduction of Federal taxation as recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

422. Also, petition of the American Paper & Pulp Association opposing a bonus for able-bodied veterans and favoring reduction of taxes as proposed by Secretary Mellon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

423. Also, petitions of the Nelson Knitting Co., of Rockford, Ill., and sundry citizens of Rockford, De Kalb, and Chicago, Ill., favoring the reduction of Federal taxation as proposed by Secretary Mellon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

424. Also, petition of the United Association of Post Office Clerks of the United States, favoring reclassification and increase of the salaries of post-office employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

425. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of the Ladies Auxiliary No. 93 of Branch No. 122, Postal Employees, Lansing, Mich., favoring a fair adjustment of postal salaries commensurate with

the arduous labor and responsibilities of the postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

426. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition of citizens of the third congressional district of Iowa, favoring Mellon's tax-reduction plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

427. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of the board of railway commissioners of the State of North Dakota, in favor of amending the transportation act for the purpose of restoring to the citizens the rights guaranteed under the Constitution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

428. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of employees of the Remington Cash Register Co., Ilion, N. Y., in favor of reduction of taxes and against the bonus for able-bodied veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

429. Also, petition of employees of the Remington Arms Co., Ilion, N. Y., in favor of the reduction of taxes and against the bonus for able-bodied veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

430. By Mr. WOODRUM: Petition of Benjamin Powell and others, relating to House bills 186 and 506, providing for increase in pay of employees of Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 8, 1924.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Another day has come from Thy gracious hand, O God, another day of privileges. May we recognize these as gifts to be used acceptably before Thee. Thou knowest the very many besetments that constantly assail us. When we would do good, too often evil is present with us. So direct our thoughts, so influence our conduct, that while we may be prone to wander, Thou wilt realize to us Thine infinite sufficiency and guide us ever to Thy glory. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (George A. Sanderson) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1924.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. IRVINE L. LENROOT, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, to perform the duties of the Chair this legislative day.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LENROOT thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

THE JOURNAL.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PHIPPS. By request I send to the desk a petition signed by several thousand citizens of Colorado asking that Congress provide for the use of light wines and beer. I move that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STERLING. I present a statement, in the nature of a petition, from the business men of Hartford, S. Dak., favoring the passage of the agricultural diversification aid bill, being Senate bill 1597. I ask that the petition may be printed in the Record without the names and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is very short.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATE BILL 1597.

To the Hon. Senator THOMAS STERLING:

We the undersigned business men, members of the Hartford Boosters Club, hereby heartily approve the so-called Federal agricultural diversification aid bill, and urgently request that you use all influence and utmost effort in obtaining the passage of this bill. We consider it the soundest "aid bill" offered as a relief measure for the recovery of the northwest farmer up to the present time, barring none.

Mr. CAPPER. I present a resolution adopted by the convention of the National Farmers' Union at Omaha last month, asking for a higher tariff on wheat. I ask unanimous consent that it may be referred to the Committee on Finance and printed in the RECORD. It is a very short resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That as long as the farmers must pay high prices for necessities as a result of the duties for the protection of American manufacturers, it is right to insist on an equal rate of tariff on the importation of farm products. Therefore we favor an increase in the wheat tariff to 50 cents a bushel, but demand that the drawback clause in the wheat schedule, which permits our mills to import, manufacture, and reexport great quantities of Canadian wheat in direct competition with American producers, be repealed.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a petition of rural letter carriers of several counties of the State of Arkansas, praying for the enactment of legislation providing a rural letter carrier's equipment allowance, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. WILLIS presented a petition of officers and employees of the Bryant Bros. Co., of Columbus, Ohio, praying for the adoption of the so-called Mellon tax-reduction plan, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wolf, Wyo., praying for the reduction of taxes and postponement of soldiers' bonus legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, of New York, favoring the enactment of legislation reducing income taxes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution of the Big Horn Basin Federated Club, of Basin, Wyo., protesting against the passage of legislation establishing further national parks in the State of Wyoming, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

He also presented resolutions of the Board of Trade of Rawlins, the Council of Industry of Laramie, the Lions Club of Rock Springs, the Lions Club of Cheyenne, and the Chamber of Commerce of Cheyenne, all in the State of Wyoming, protesting against the enactment of any immediate amendment of the transportation act of 1920, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 210) for the relief of Peter C. Keegan, and others, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 18) thereon.

Mr. MAYFIELD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 214) for the relief of the Old National Bank of Martinsburg, Martinsburg, W. Va., reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 19) thereon.

Mr. LADD, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 602) to revive and to reenact an act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Arkansas River between the cities of Little Rock and Argenta, Ark.," approved October 6, 1917 (Rept. No. 20);

A bill (S. 625) authorizing Independence County, Ark., to construct a bridge across the White River, at or near Batesville, Ark. (Rept. No. 21); and

A bill (S. 733) to authorize the construction of a highway bridge over the Hudson River at Poughkeepsie, N. Y. (Rept. No. 22).

CAPT. EDMUND G. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred Senate Resolution 25, submitted by Mr. SHEPARD December 10, 1923, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs is authorized and directed to continue its investigation of the facts leading to the court-martial as well as the court-martial proceedings and all the findings in the case of former Capt. Edmund G. Chamberlain, United States Marine Corps, and report to Congress.

SPECULATIONS IN WHEAT.

Mr. LADD. From the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution No. 9, and I ask for its immediate consideration. It is a resolution calling on the Secretary of Agriculture for information with regard to the sale of grain for speculation in Chicago during the past two months.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the resolution?

Mr. KING. Let it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The reading clerk read Senate Resolution No. 9, submitted by Mr. LADD December 8, 1923, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas since the grain futures act was declared constitutional by the United States Supreme Court on April 16, 1923, members of the Chicago Board of Trade and other grain exchanges, with a few exceptions, by means of their daily market reports and published opinions in the daily papers, and also market press reports written in Chicago and given wide publicity, together with syndicated articles which there is reason to believe had their inspiration in the board of trade, have systematically opposed the price of wheat or, in trade terms, tried to "bear the market"; and because of this condition there is reason to believe that the market was, except during brief intervals, depressed by short selling by professional traders or speculators, and that the price has been depressed and held materially below a level warranted by legitimate supply and demand conditions; and, furthermore, because no information has been published by the Department of Agriculture regarding the activities of such speculators: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be requested to take steps at once to determine, through the grain-futures administration, the position on the market taken by the well-known professional speculators and the members of the large "futures" commission houses of the board of trade, and promptly publish the findings, without opinions by the investigators as to the effect which the trading by said professionals may have had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ROBINSON. It has been impossible to hear any part of the resolution as it was read. I understood that it was something affecting board of trade transactions in grain.

Mr. LADD. It was.

Mr. ROBINSON. I wish the Senator bringing forward the resolution would make a brief explanation as to its scope and purpose.

Mr. LADD. The purpose of the resolution is to have the Secretary of Agriculture furnish certain information with regard to speculation in buying and handling grain in the Chamber of Commerce in Chicago. Taken in connection with a report which will be released to-morrow from the Federal Trade Commission with regard to speculation and conspiracy that have been found to have taken place in Minneapolis in the Chamber of Commerce, it seemed desirable to know whether the low prices for wheat at times prevailing during the past year were due to speculation in grain in Chicago. The resolution calls for the information as to what those buyers were doing.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection to the present consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

GORDON G. MACDONALD

Mr. CAPPER. By direction of the Committee on Claims I ask that that committee may be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1013) for the relief of Gordon G. MacDonald, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPLETION OF MUNICIPAL BRIDGE AT ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. LADD. From the Committee on Commerce I report favorably and without amendment two bridge bills. The bills also have the approval of the War Department. One bill was introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] and the other by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. There is no objection to them, and it is desired that they have immediate consideration.

I report first from the Committee on Commerce the bill (S. 987) to extend the time for the completion of the municipal bridge approaches, and extensions or additions thereto, by the city of St. Louis within the States of Illinois and Missouri, and

I submit a report (No. 23) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to ask the Senator from North Dakota if the bill which he has just reported is a regular bridge bill? I judge from its title that there is something more involved in it than an ordinary bridge bill.

Mr. LADD. The bill which I have just reported provides for the extension of time within which the bridge may be constructed, while the other bill which I intend to report is a regular bridge bill. Both bills are reported without amendment and both, as a matter of fact, have the approval of the War Department.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it a combined bill which the Senator now reports?

Mr. LADD. There are two bills, one providing for an extension of the time within which the bridge may be constructed, and the other is in the ordinary form of a bridge bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill just reported by the Senator from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 987) to extend the time for the completion of the municipal bridge approaches, and extensions or additions thereto, by the city of St. Louis within the States of Illinois and Missouri, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for the construction and completion of the municipal bridge approaches and also extensions or additions thereto, which said construction and completion was authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the city of St. Louis, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Missouri, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River," approved June 25, 1906, be, and the same is hereby, extended for the period of three years from February 10, 1924.

Sec. 2. That for the purpose of carrying into effect the objects of this act the city of St. Louis may receive, purchase, and also acquire by lawful appropriation and condemnation in the States of Illinois and Missouri upon making proper compensation therefor, to be ascertained according to the laws of the State within which the same is located, real and personal property and rights of property and, in order to facilitate and support interstate commerce, may make any and every use of the same necessary and proper for the acquirement, construction, maintenance, and operation of said municipal bridge approaches, and extensions or additions thereto, consistent with the laws of the United States.

Sec. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McKINLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, Senate bill 987, a bridge bill, was passed this morning rather quickly. I move that the action of the Senate on that bill be reconsidered. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] is interested in it, and he is not here at this moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois moves that the vote by which Senate bill 987 was passed be reconsidered.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be returned to the calendar.

COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE AT VANTAGE FERRY, WASH.

Mr. LADD. I also report from the Committee on Commerce without amendment the bill (S. 1225) granting the consent of Congress to Elbert M. Chandler and his successors to construct a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Vantage Ferry, Wash., and I submit a report (No. 24) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Elbert M. Chandler, a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of Washington, and his successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Columbia River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near a crossing point known as Vantage Ferry, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there are quite a number of Senators who wish to be absent until a little after 2 o'clock to-day, in order to hear an address which is going to be made by Frau Schreiber. I should, therefore, like to get an understanding, if possible, that there shall be no vote taken on the election of a chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee before 15 minutes after 2 o'clock. If it can be arranged, I should like to have some such understanding.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] has given notice that he intends to speak and will probably occupy one hour. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] is also going to speak for 20 minutes. So I see no reason why we could not make the agreement asked for by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, then I ask unanimous consent that there be no vote taken on the question of the election of a chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce before 2.30 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that there be no vote taken on the question of the election of a chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee before 2.30 o'clock to-day. Is there objection? There being no objection, it will be so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT HARDING.

Mr. McNARY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an eloquent address delivered at the memorial service for the late President Harding in the Grand Lodge, Knights of Pythias, of Oregon, at Portland, Oreg., October 8, 1923. The address was delivered by Hon. Willard L. Marks, supreme representative of that order from Oregon.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR PRESIDENT HARDING IN GRAND LODGE, KNIGHTS OF PYTHIAS, OF OREGON, AT PORTLAND, OREG., OCTOBER 8, 1923.

[Delivered by Hon. Willard L. Marks, of Albany, Oreg., supreme representative from Oregon.]

We know that time is a tomb builder. We realize full well the inevitableness of death. Yet every time a final summons comes it brings some measure of sadness. The somewhat unusual occurrence of the death of a President of the United States is always cause for universal regret. But grief more general and sorrow more widespread than is usual even in such events was evident everywhere when on the evening of the 2d day of last August there flashed to every corner of the United States the tragic news that Warren G. Harding was dead. The entire country bowed in sorrow for the dual reason that a beloved President was gone and that he had been called at the height of his usefulness, when he possessed such splendid capabilities for successful service in the future.

The millions who heard the news of his death with sorrow-filled hearts did not grieve because they were or were not of the political party to which he gave allegiance. The throngs who stood in silence and with bared head at every station as the funeral train, freighted with the Nation's sorrow, made its long journey across the continent from the many-hilled city by the Golden Gate to the history-crowned Capital on the Potomac, paid this reverential tribute not because they agreed or disagreed with his ideas of government. The multitude unnumbered who with tear-dimmed eyes lined historic Pennsylvania Avenue as the funeral procession passed stood thus not because of any kind of political belief. The situation was simply this: A great man was dead and the Nation mourned.

It is not necessary in this presence to review the events of President Harding's life. Nor, as I take it, is it necessary to pay any extended tribute to his success-crowned record. You all knew him as a man who not only was practical in administering the Nation's business affairs but who possessed vision for the future of his country and the world; who, as he phrased it himself, had faith in the destiny of this Republic; who believed in his heart and soul and by precept and example inspired others to believe in steadfast adherence to the fundamentals of American liberty and the maintenance inviolate of our constitutional rights and those traditions and institutions which have made the United States the greatest Nation in the history of men and America the most alluring name in the vocabulary of mankind; who, mindful of the lessons of history and experience, proceeded with calmness and caution, but labored always with optimism and hope to promote and make lasting the greatest measure of happiness for all the people; a man who not only was a great President, a great national leader, but an ideal private citizen and a whole-souled humanity-loving Christian gentleman.

I do desire to speak of him, briefly, as a fraternalist, and particularly as a Pythian Knight. Warren Harding learned his first fraternal lesson in the order of Knights of Pythias. He joined this fraternity just after he became 21 years of age and continued his membership throughout the remainder of his eventful life. On the morning following his death the executive officers of this grand lodge, recognizing this membership and always ready to aid in giving the full measure of sympathy to the distressed, sent to that wonderful woman who was the wife, companion, and helpmeet of our deceased President the following message:

AUGUST 3, 1923.

Mrs. WARREN G. HARDING,
Palace Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.:

The members of the order of Knights of Pythias in Oregon extend sincerest sympathy to you. May God in His kindness be gracious unto you in this time of your sorrow and need of comfort.

MILLARD F. HARDESTY, *Grand Chancellor*.
WALTER G. GLEESON, *Secretary*.

In reply thereto there is on file in the office of Brother Gleeson the following acknowledgment:

"Mrs. Harding deeply appreciates your message of sympathy, and begs that you will express her sincere gratitude to those associated with you."

The private and public life of our late President was characterized more than all else by prudence. We have the statement of President Harding himself that he learned that prudence from the ritual of this fraternity. In a great Pythian gathering held in 1921 in the city of Washington in the very building in which this fraternity was organized President Harding in the course of a talk he made on that occasion gave credit to the order of Knights of Pythias for teaching him the caution and prudence which has so marked all the steps of his official career. Most assuredly that is one of the most remarkable tributes ever paid in any way at any time to the order of Knights of Pythias and the inspiration and the practical helpfulness of its ritualistic instruction.

President Harding was the friend of all who offered friendship worthily. He greeted his fellow men not with the effervescence of the demagogue, not with the exuberance of the professional opportunist, but with a quiet and calm, though withal pleasant, sincerity which left its impress on the hearts of men. He realized that the weaknesses of mankind, which have existed ever since the serpent appeared in the Garden of Eden, can not be reformed in a day or a year and that conditions must be met with practical common sense instead of fanciful dreams. But his every thought, his every word, his every act was in keeping with the fraternal idea of looking toward the ultimate goal of real brotherhood among men.

He had caught the vision of real service. He gave his very best to every task. He emphasized the fundamental idea of the development and perpetuation of home life. To the Nation's best fraternities he gave the support of his membership and the benefit of his widening influence in the high places where he served. It is conceded that his devotion to his country has never been excelled, and in keeping with his craving to be of service to humanity he was seeking ardently when death struck him down for practical methods to relieve the distress of a war-torn, suffering-torn world.

There are many here to-day who just three short months ago when he visited and spoke in the city of Portland saw this great President, whom history will rank as one of this Nation's most useful citizens of all time. They saw a man who fulfilled the popular ideal of how a President of this great Nation should look, a man with noble, clean-cut features, of pleasing appearance and lovable personality, and who spoke with a fervor of tongue which surely came from honesty of heart.

President Harding has embarked on that journey from which none return. But while his legion of friends and admirers will miss him, while his country will lose the benefit of his counsel and guidance, his soul will progress in a new and perhaps greater sphere of activity. We, as Knights of Pythias, whatever our individual religious creeds may be, believe in the mercy and goodness of a Divine Creator; we know from the "Divinity which stirs within us" that what we call death is not the end of man. Therefore we have an unflinching faith and take comfort in it, in thinking of the passing of this great man, that—

"There is no death;
What seems so is transition.
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life Elysian,
Whose portal we call death."

The flooding tide of destiny which less than three years ago bore Warren Harding eastward from his Ohio home to become the leader of his native land has ebbed westward again, this time with life's setting sun. But behind him there linger memories which any man would be proud indeed to know were in the minds of men as they thought of

him. There are memories of Harding, the struggling young, typical American starting out bravely and hopefully to meet the battles of life; of Harding, the successful editor and publisher; of Harding, the leader in the affairs of his city and State as he progressed upward through high places "where the restless winds of ambition blow," until he attained the summit of public service in the world. There are memories of Harding, the President, which are memories of devotion to duty, of loyalty to friends, of high courage in office, of careful use of great power, of uncompromising love of country, of hope to better the condition of humanity. There are memories also of Harding, the fraternalist, kind, friendly and thoughtful of others, with modest, simple ways no pride of place could change.

The book of his earthly life is closed forever. But so long as the children of America are taught at their mother's knee to appreciate and follow high ideals, so long as our public schools continue to teach reverence for and observance of the fundamentals and traditions of American liberty, so long as the hearts of men glean inspiration from the lessons of service and sacrifice, so long will the life of Warren G. Harding shine forth on the pages of history to point the way to greater deeds, to higher thoughts, to nobler achievements in private life, in duty to home and country, in statesmanship and diplomacy, and in the great realm of fraternity.

As citizens of the great Nation he served so well, as members of his first fraternity, wherein he learned the lessons of friendship and prudence, we pause in our labors this day to pay tribute to the memory of Warren G. Harding. Already column after column has been written of his life and work, eulogies by the hundreds have been pronounced throughout this country, and page after page has been filled with the wealth of his achievements. Our hearts have harmonized, our thoughts kept step with this procession of praise. But the highest honor we can give, the greatest tribute we can pay to the great President who has gone is to live as he lived and be the kind of useful citizen he was, emulating his high ideals of citizenship and of service, giving the best there is in us to our country, working for the development of fraternity among men, contributing to the welfare of all mankind, and believing as he believed in the glory of God and the destiny of the American Republic.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 1817) for the payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section No. 151 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1818) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1921; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CURTIS (for Mr. ERSER):

A bill (S. 1820) for the establishment of a United States Industrial Reformatory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

A bill (S. 1821) for the relief of Luther Lysander Martin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1822) granting an increase of pension to Patrick J. O'Brien;

A bill (S. 1823) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Doepel; and

A bill (S. 1824) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 1825) granting a pension to Leo Forst; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY (by request):

A bill (S. 1826) to be known as the corporation act, to safeguard the American people in their investments in securities, and to prescribe rules for the sale of securities on public stock exchanges doing business within the confines of the United States of America and the Territories under its control, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. I want the RECORD to show that the bill was introduced at the request of another.

Mr. KING. May I inquire to what committee the Senator from Oregon desires to have the bill referred?

Mr. McNARY. I assume it should go to the Committee on the Judiciary. I have no particular preference. It might well go to the Committee on Commerce. Either of those committees in my opinion would have jurisdiction under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon wish to have the bill referred to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. McNARY. I believe technically that would be the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so referred.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 1827) to authorize the extension and widening of Albemarle Street, Davenport Street, and Thirty-ninth Street NW.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 1828) to supplement the military record of Lieut. Commander Charles O. Maas; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 1829) for the relief of the Hunter-Brown Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 1830) to enlarge, extend, remodel, etc., public building at Lakeland, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FERRIS:

A bill (S. 1831) for the relief of Alonzo C. Shekell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 1832) granting allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment to postmasters of the fourth class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1833) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1921; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1834) for the relief of the legal representative of Robert Dillon, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1835) to amend the second proviso of section 89 of an act entitled "An act providing for the public printing and binding and distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895; to the Committee on Printing.

A bill (S. 1836) to amend an act entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862, as amended by the act approved March 3, 1883; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. CARAWAY:

A bill (S. 1837) granting the consent of Congress to the Fulton Ferry & Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Red River at or near Fulton, Ark.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1838) for the relief of Clarence Winborn; and

A bill (S. 1839) for the relief of Charles H. Birmingham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 1840) granting a pension to Anna T. Eldred;

A bill (S. 1841) granting a pension to Kate Bacon;

A bill (S. 1842) granting a pension to Robert Furlong;

A bill (S. 1843) granting a pension to Florence C. Clarke;

A bill (S. 1844) granting a pension to Jacob Miller; and

A bill (S. 1845) granting a pension to Libbie M. Ryan; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1846) for the relief of George H. Ewart; and

A bill (S. 1847) to correct the naval record of George Wilson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 1848) granting a pension to Sarah A. Douglas (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1849) granting a pension to Martha Kailey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1850) granting a pension to Reece Tunks (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1851) granting a pension to Martha A. Brigance (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1852) granting a pension to William K. Price (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1853) granting an increase of pension to Harry L. Hoff (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1854) granting an increase of pension to Ella Bailey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 1855) granting a pension to Fred Bronson;

A bill (S. 1856) granting a pension to John R. Scott;

A bill (S. 1857) granting an increase of pension to Mary Lamb; and

A bill (S. 1858) granting a pension to Elizabeth Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A bill (S. 1859) granting an increase of pension to Grant H. Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED of Pennsylvania:

A bill (S. 1860) granting a pension to Catherine Holden Jenkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 1861) authorizing the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render final judgment in the claim of Elwood Grissinger; and

A bill (S. 1862) for the relief of Benjamin Stern, and Melville A. Stern and Benjamin Stern, as executors under the last will and testament of Louis Stern, deceased, and Arthur H. Hahlo, as executor under the last will and testament of Isaac Stern, deceased, all of New York City, N. Y. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEPPER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations and to the several States of the United States to participate in the world's congress of engineers to be held in Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SALE OF ARMS AND MUNITIONS ABROAD.

Mr. ROBINSON. I introduce a bill and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The bill (S. 1819) to prevent the sale of arms and munitions to foreign governments and to foreign military or political authorities by the United States and any citizen or corporation thereof was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act, except when the United States is engaged in war, it shall be unlawful for any officer, agent, citizen, or corporation of the United States to sell or offer to sell, to deliver or attempt to deliver, arms or munitions to any foreign government or to any foreign political or military officer or agent.

Any person convicted of violating this act shall be punished by fine in any sum not exceeding \$100,000 and by imprisonment not exceeding one year.

The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to enforce this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CORPORATE PAYMENT OF EXCESS-PROFITS TAX.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I submit a Senate resolution, which I ask to have printed and go over, under the rule, for consideration to-morrow.

The resolution (S. Res. 115) was read and ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, requested to furnish to the Senate information regarding the excess-profits taxes of corporations, based upon the business of 1921 and for which returns or assessments were made during the year 1922, as follows:

For each serial number of corporations, as indicated on pages 58 to 65, inclusive, Table 9, "Statistics of income from returns of net income for 1921," as compiled and published under the direction of the collector of internal revenue:

(a) The number of corporations in each serial number reporting income subject to taxation under the first bracket of the revenue act of 1921, together with the amount of net earnings subject to such tax and the amount of tax assessed thereon.

(b) The number of corporations in each serial number reporting income subject to taxation under the second bracket of said act, together with the amount of net earnings subject to such tax and the amount of tax assessed thereon.

CLARENCE MACKAY.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, merely to explain and more fully to answer a question which was asked yesterday during the debate on the recognition of Russia as to the negro to whom Trotsky addressed the letter which I then read, I desire to state that the man's full name is Clarence MacKay. He is not Clarence H. Mackay who controls the Mackay cables, I may say. His name is Clarence MacKay. He gave his address at a hearing at Ellis Island as associate editor of The Liberator, 232 West One hundred and thirty-eighth Street, New York City. He gave that address some little time ago. He may possibly have since changed his address, but I am having inquiries made in order to ascertain what his exact address is at the present time.

PAYMENT OF EXPENSES OF OFFICE OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, for the RECORD and in the nature of a correction which I desire to have made, I wish to call attention to a statement made by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on December 20 and appearing in the RECORD on page 457. The statement of the Senator from Florida is as follows:

Will any Senator on the other side rise in his place and propose that the national banks of this country shall pay the salaries of the Comptroller of the Currency and all the officers and assistants under him, comprising all the expenses of that bureau?

I asked the Comptroller of the Currency to let me know what the records of his office show as to the payments made by the national banks of the country to cover the expenses of his office. I have a letter from him, dated January 3, 1924, reading as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 3, 1924.

Hon. REED SMOOT,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On page 149 of the Comptroller's Report for 1923, copy of which I inclose, you will find detail of the net operations of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency.

The net result of the operations of this bureau to the Government, as shown by this statement, is a profit of \$3,131,718.63. The total expenses of the bureau were \$5,226,751.46. The contribution made by assessment on the banks was \$4,214,296.47, and the balance of \$1,012,454.99 was covered out of governmental appropriations. Instead of it being a just statement to say that the national banks did not pay for their governmental supervision and note-issuing powers the fact is that the Government realized a net profit of \$3,131,718.63.

I was very sorry not to be in when you called this morning, and hope that this information will answer your question, and in time to be of service.

Yours very truly,

HENRY M. DAWES, Comptroller.

I merely wanted that statement to go into the RECORD so that there may be no mistake made in the future.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I think it proper that I should make a brief statement following the observations of the Senator from Utah.

The point I made in connection with the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency was that the salaries of the comptroller himself and of his assistants and the expenses of his office were paid out of the Treasury of the United States, while the legislation which sought, in a way, to separate the Farm Loan Bureau from the Treasury Department provided that all the salaries of the members of the Farm Loan Board and the entire expenses of that board should be paid by the Federal land bank, and, therefore, there was a national distinction thus made. While it may be true that by levying assessments on the national banks to cover the expenses of examination and that sort of thing the sums realized amount to more than the actual salaries and expenses of the comptroller's office, the fact still remains that those expenses and salaries are paid out of the Treasury and are not paid by the national banks.

The difference is that, under legislation passed on March 4 last, the Federal land banks are now required to pay directly all the expenses of the Farm Loan Board, including the salaries of the members of the Farm Loan Board, although that is a bureau of the Treasury. The Federal land banks also pay the expenses of the examiners that are appointed in connection with those banks.

Now, it happens—and I am very glad it is so—that the Comptroller of the Currency, in order to cover the expenses of the examination, levies an assessment on the national banks which more than equals the cost of the examination.

Mr. SMOOT. There is a net profit of more than \$3,000,000 a year.

Mr. FLETCHER. The assessment is sufficient to more than equal the cost of the examination; but there is no law, I think, which fixes absolutely and permanently the cost of the examination for each bank. It might be that the figures will vary from year to year.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the law requires that there should be at least three examinations a year, and frequently five examinations are made a year.

Mr. FLETCHER. I recognize that the law requires a more or less number of examinations, but at the same time the difference still exists that the expenses of the comptroller's office are paid out of the Treasury. They happen to raise enough money by charging for the examinations that are made to more than offset that. I am very glad that is true. I do not

think that is equivalent, however, to requiring the banks themselves to pay the comptroller's salary and the salaries of the officers and assistants and employees under him. It happens that they get enough out of the banks to more than offset that expense, but it is not the same thing. That was the point I sought to make in the observations I made the other day.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, no one can read the Senator's remarks without concluding that the Senator thought that the national banks of the United States were not assessed an amount sufficient to pay the expenses of examinations and the operations of the Comptroller of the Currency with regard to the banks. I have read over the Senator's remarks time and time again, and nobody can construe them in any other light. The national banks would be delighted to take the same position that the Federal land banks are given, namely, paying just for the examinations. They would save over \$3,000,000 every year if they were allowed to occupy that position, and I am not asking that any change be made so far as the national banks are concerned. I do not care if they do pay \$3,000,000 more than the expenses that are incurred, but I did not want the impression to go out to the country that we are treating the Federal farm loan banks in a more drastic manner than we are treating the national banks of the United States.

Mr. FLETCHER. I again say that the cost of examination of the Federal farm loan banks is paid by those banks, and that cost is in the control of the Farm Loan Board. That is a similar transaction to assessing the national banks for the cost of their examinations. I did not know at the time—I had not seen the figures—whether or not that assessment, made for examinations, equaled the entire cost of the bureau. I was not advised as to that. I had not examined the report; but I was satisfied of the position that the cost of that bureau was paid out of the Treasury of the United States, which, by the amendment to the farm loan act last March, the cost of the Farm Loan Bureau is now paid by the Federal land banks and not out of the Treasury. That difference, shown this year, between the expenses of the Bureau of the Currency and the fees for examinations may not be the same next year; it may not be the year after; it may be greater or less. It is a varying figure; and I take it that as at present administered, inasmuch as the assessments more than equal the cost of the bureau, there is no ground of complaint or criticism; but the distinction that I pointed out still exists.

As I say, this figure may vary from year to year. A time may come when it will not equal the cost of that bureau. That is a challenge situation. At present it seems that it more than equals the cost of the bureau, and there is no ground of complaint about that. In fact, I was not complaining at all about the operation of the law with reference to the Comptroller of the Currency. I accept the report of the comptroller. I approve of the law respecting this bureau of the Treasury. I wanted the same sort of law to operate with reference to the other bureau of the Treasury—the Farm Loan Board. I made no complaint about the office of the Comptroller of the Currency being conducted as it is under the law as it exists. I am in favor of that, and I wanted the same law to apply to the Farm Loan Board. There is no reason or justice in making the distinction which by the amendment of March 4 last to the farm loan act is made.

That is the position I take.

FRANCIS SCOTT KEY BRIDGE.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a bill which has been reported favorably from the Committee on the Library, being Senate bill 627, authorizing the Daughters of the War of 1812 to install upon the Francis Scott Key Bridge a memorial tablet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a bill the title of which will be stated by the Secretary.

The READING CLERK. A bill (S. 627) to authorize the National Society United States Daughters of 1812 to place a bronze tablet on the Francis Scott Key Bridge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed to add, in line 9, page 1, after the words "plans and specifications," the words "the installation of said tablet to be under the direction of the

Commissioners of the District of Columbia," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the National Society United States Daughters of 1812 is authorized to place, on the Francis Scott Key Bridge across Potomac River, a bronze tablet, inscribed with the insignia of such society and with the last verse of the Star-Spangled Banner, after the plans and specifications for such tablet have been submitted to, and approved by, the Commission of Fine Arts on such plans and specifications, the installation of said tablet to be under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. Such tablet shall be erected without expense to the Government of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE VETERANS' BUREAU.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement in regard to the publication in the newspapers of last night and this morning of what appears to be the report of counsel to the select committee which is examining into the Veterans' Bureau.

The extracts from that so-called report were printed without the knowledge or consent of the committee of the Senate which is making the investigation. What was printed appears to be extracts from the first proof received from the printer of General O'Ryan's report, and that has been very extensively changed in subsequent proofs. General O'Ryan has not taken up the report with the committee; has not submitted his report to the committee; has not yet consulted most of the committee about it; and what appeared in the newspapers is not in any sense an approved or authorized or final statement from the committee or from its counsel.

I ask the Senate to pay no attention to the newspaper extracts that have appeared. We hope to have our final report, including that part of counsel's report with which we agree, ready for the Senate within 10 days. There are a great many recommendations made by General O'Ryan with which we are in entire agreement and there are some with which we do not agree. I ask the Senate to reserve judgment on this subject until we can get in our report in final form.

PROPOSED BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business is closed.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I do not want to interfere with the Senator's address, but in order to have a measure before the Senate, and one that I desire to have disposed of as soon as possible, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 76) to create a bureau of aeronautics in the Department of Commerce, to encourage and regulate the operation of civil aircraft in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, a number of Senators gave notice of an intention to address the Senate upon the conclusion of the morning business. With the understanding that they may proceed with their addresses at their pleasure, I have no objection to the request.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly. Now I submit the request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill he has indicated. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 76) to create a bureau of aeronautics in the Department of Commerce, to encourage and regulate the operation of civil aircraft in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

TAX REDUCTION AND THE BONUS.

Mr. COPELAND obtained the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Brookhart	Cameron	Couzens
Ashurst	Broussard	Capper	Curtis
Ball	Bruce	Caraway	Dale
Bayard	Bursum	Copeland	Dial

Edge
Edwards
Fernald
Ferris
Fess
Fletcher
Frazier
George
Gerry
Glass
Gooding
Greene
Hale
Harrell
Harris
Harrison

Johnson, Minn.
Jones, N. Mex.
Jones, Wash.
Kendrick
Keyes
King
Ladd
La Follette
Lenroot
Lodge
McCormick
McKellar
McKinley
McLean
McNary
Mayfield

Moses
Neely
Norbeck
Oddie
Overman
Pepper
Phipps
Pittman
Ralston
Reed, Pa.
Robinson
Sheppard
Shields
Shortridge
Simmons
Smith

Smoot
Spencer
Stanfield
Stephens
Sterling
Swanson
Trammell
Walsh, Mass.
Walsh, Mont.
Warren
Watson
Weller
Wheeler
Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate on the subject of the bonus and tax reduction.

I am a convert to the idea of a bonus. But I am not a recent convert, nor was my conversion an instantaneous one. Its beginnings date back to the end of the war, when I made my first visit to the battle fields. My growing conviction that a bonus is fair and just became more firmly fixed during the period of the return of our soldiers. I saw them dismayed by the loss of their jobs and by their difficulties in becoming socially readjusted. My suspicion grew into fixed conviction in 1922 when, in visiting the western, eastern, and northern Italian fronts, I saw the preparations for renewed conflict on the part of certain European countries and the dismal failure of the war to effect any permanent accomplishment for the cause of world peace.

Had the war ended the armaments, the conscriptions, and the burdens of taxation for the machinery of conflict, there might have been glory enough to compensate our soldiers for all it cost them. This the war failed to accomplish. The lack of vision of those who stood and still stand in the way of happy termination of the evil controversy have ruined the aspirations and ambitions of the vast horde of young men who cheerfully answered the call to arms.

The sacrifice having failed to accomplish its purpose, there is no subjective reward except the satisfaction of having done what seemed to be a duty. In marked contrast to the exaltation which would have followed success, there are the unhappiness, the feeling of hopelessness, and the downright misery of knowing that the world has not been made safe for democracy, that world peace has not been established, and that the sacrifices and efforts were vainly made. Instead of the joy of achievement there is an overwhelming sense of failure.

I saw where the soldiers lived and where they died. I saw the trenches filled with mud and vermin. The barracks where many of our boys slept, when the cooties would permit, were not fit houses for common poultry.

I saw the ruins of great cities, where not even a tiny cottage and hardly a single room remained intact. I saw millions of acres of torn-up ground, with razed buildings and ruined homes.

I saw cemeteries where thousands upon thousands of our boys are buried and where row upon row of graves tell the story of what war means. I saw there the star of David and the cross, where Jew and gentile, Catholic and Protestant, have been laid to rest.

The dead are not the only casualties of the war. I visited the hospitals where thousands of maimed and frightfully shattered men are awaiting death or looking forward to the certainty of hampered lives.

In the museum of one hospital in Europe I saw hundreds upon hundreds of mutilated and ruined eyes, extracted from sons of loving mothers and now put up in glass boxes to be gazed upon as terrible reminders of what horrid war can do.

I visited Chateau-Thierry where the American soldiers demonstrated for the first time on foreign soil their equality certainly, and even their superiority, to the trained military products of the monarchies of the Old World.

After that city was taken by our men and the last shot had been fired a woman who had her residence there came back to find her home in ruins. She went around the destroyed building into the garden at the rear and here came upon 24 dead soldiers, 23 in the khaki of the United States and 1 in the blue of France. Being a French woman, naturally she went first to the boy in blue. She found her own son, who had died in that garden.

I can not think of the war without thinking of the mothers. Through heartaches and sleepless nights they suffered as the soldiers themselves never suffered. When any reflection is cast on the veteran the wounds of her heart are torn open. I have no doubt many a mother is saddened and embittered by need-

lessly harsh things uttered during the present controversy over the bonus.

When the war ended scores of doctors came to my office in the health department of the city of New York seeking a living by being appointed to the medical staff. Most of these men had enjoyed lucrative practices, but they came back from camp or battle field to find their clientele dissipated and their means of livelihood destroyed. The doctors who remained at home, innocently unconscious of the effects upon their former associates, had annexed and absorbed their business.

The members of all professions suffered in this manner. Nonprofessional men were just as bad off in another way. Their old jobs were filled, and it took a long time to find employment of any sort.

Priority means much in employment. The year or two the men were away in the Army resulted in their being passed by in the promotion lists. Because of absence, they missed opportunities—opportunities seized upon by the men on the spot. In consequence the vast majority of the veterans, even now, five years after the armistice, are filling places considerably below the ones they would be filling had there been no war.

During the war there was great inflation in every line. Wages reached previously unheard-of heights. Never before, certainly within the memory of this generation, had there been such opportunities to command high wages.

The needs of Government and of society made it imperative that the essential industries be kept under full steam. Help had to be obtained at any price. There were times when the men in khaki worked 12 hours a day, and even 20 in time of need, at \$30 per month, in competition with civilian employees on the same job, who worked only 8 hours a day for \$200 or \$300 per month.

Can you wonder that murmurings of discontent are heard on every side? The thing I can not understand is why there has been such delay in attempting some adjustment of compensation between the meager stipend of the men in uniform and the high wages received by their brothers in civilian life.

The great majority of our ex-soldiers think we owe this money. They believe the Government should pay it.

Personally, I don't want any man who has the slightest excuse for claiming I owe him money—I do not want any such man to go about thinking I am depriving him of his just deserts. I want to pay him. Certainly, rich Uncle Sam wants to pay the soldiers if there is the slightest evidence that a debt exists.

I would offer these patriotic men a decent adjustment of compensation. I would do this, not as a charity or as a reward but as an act of simple justice.

I would do it because the soldier honestly thinks the country owes it to him.

I would do it because we have no right to cause unhappiness to the wives and mothers of the soldiers.

I would do it because my own sense of justice says we owe a debt which should have been paid long ago.

In my own case there is an additional reason why I shall vote for a reasonable bonus. I have an old-fashioned idea that elected officials should keep the promises they make when running for office. In my campaign for the Senate I pledged myself to the bonus, and I shall vote for it, even though I am never reelected to the Senate as a result of my action.

But I do not for a moment doubt that the American people favor the bonus. Twice in my own State—the second time no later than November 6 last—a referendum on the State bonus carried overwhelmingly by nearly 400,000 majority. I have no doubt a referendum submitted to the voters of New York State would show the same favorable result for a national bonus. Wherever I have spoken during the last two years—in half the States of the Union—loud applause has invariably greeted my enthusiastic indorsement of adjusted compensation for the veterans.

Let no one tell me that the voters of this country are against the bonus. I know better. Even the politicians have unanimously pledged themselves to it. Consult the platform and election promises of both parties—all concerned have promised generous treatment of the veterans.

A sentiment frequently expressed by my correspondents is that there would be doubt of the patriotism of the veterans if they accepted a bonus.

It is just as indecent for a man to reflect on the honor and patriotism of a veteran who accepts an adjustment of compensation as it is for the same man to question the motive of a Senator who raises his voice in this cause for no other reason than because he has a conviction that the veteran is entitled to receive it.

Following this war practically every country involved granted some sort of a bonus. Great Britain was generous. Canada gave \$600 per man. Australia and New Zealand gave over \$400 per capita. France and Belgium did not forget their veterans.

Should not rich America do something?

To give a bonus is common practice in the business world. Every bank in New York City paid its employees generous bonuses this year, I am informed, as they do every Christmas. This is done with money which comes from the public. There is no consistency in giving such grants to civilian employees and denying a similar privilege to the men who fought our battles during the war.

The excuse of lack of funds may have justified the last veto. That excuse does not exist now. There is no present justification for delay. Congress should and must act at once.

Were it not so serious a matter it would be laughable to see what arguments are grasped by the heels and dragged into this debate. One would think that the idea of a bonus is new. As a matter of fact, from the early history of our country, after every war our soldiers have been given some sort of a bonus or bounty. If there were anything disgraceful about it it would reflect upon the memory of great men, outstanding figures, and numbered among the heroes of our history.

Do you know that Gen. Phil Sheridan received 160 acres of land as an additional compensation for his service in the Indian War of 1853?

Do you know that Gen. William T. Sherman, for service in the Seminole Indian and Mexican wars, received 160 acres of land in addition to his salary as an officer in the Army?

Do you know that Gen. Winfield Scott, for his service in the Mexican War, was given a similar bonus?

Do you know that Admiral David G. Farragut, for service as midshipman in the War of 1812 and commander in the Mexican War, received 160 acres of land in addition to his salary as an officer in the Navy?

Do you know that Gen. Robert E. Lee, who served as a captain in the Mexican War, received a grant of 160 acres of land under the act of 1850?

Do you know that Gen. U. S. Grant received a bounty of 160 acres of land for his services as a second lieutenant in the Mexican War?

Finally, may I ask, do you know that Abraham Lincoln, who served 40 days as a captain in the Black Hawk Indian War in 1832, received for his services, as late as 1850, 40 acres of land? Hanging on the wall in room 306 of the Pension Office Building in Washington is the original application signed by Mr. Lincoln on August 21, 1855, making application for 120 acres of additional land provided by subsequent act of Congress for soldiers in that war.

I have here, Mr. President, a photostat of the application signed by Robert E. Lee and one signed by General Grant and a letter which General Grant wrote from Detroit, Mich., on November 6, 1850, saying to the Commissioner of Pensions, "Will you please forward me my land warrant on the inclosed certificate?"

I have here a photostat of the application made by Abraham Lincoln for 120 acres of additional land after having received 40 acres 18 years after the Black Hawk war. I ask unanimous consent that the language of the essential part of these photostats and applications be printed in the RECORD.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,

County of Orange:

On this 20th day of February, A. D. 1854, personally appeared before me, a special judge within and for the county and State aforesaid, Robert E. Lee, aged 45 years, an officer of the United States Army, who, being duly sworn according to law, declares that he is the identical Robert E. Lee who was a captain in the Corps of Engineers of the Army of the United States in the late war with Mexico; that he was commissioned on or about the 7th day of July, A. D. 1838, and continued in actual service in said war until its close; that he still remains in the military service of the United States, as will appear by the records of the Engineer Department.

He makes this declaration for the purpose of obtaining the bounty land to which he may be entitled under the "act granting bounty land to certain officers and soldiers who have been engaged in the military service of the United States," passed September 28, 1850, and that he is not entitled to, nor has he received, bounty land under any other act of Congress.

R. E. LEE,

Captain, Corps of Engineers.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,

County of Wayne, ss:

On the 6th day of November, A. D. 1850, personally appeared before me, a justice of the peace within and for the county and State aforesaid, First Lieut. Ulysses S. Grant, aged 28 years, an officer of the Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, in the service of the United States, who, being duly sworn according to law, declares that he is the identical Ulysses S. Grant who was a second lieutenant and regimental quartermaster in the Fourth Regiment of United States Infantry, commanded by Col. William Whistler, in the war with Mexico declared to exist on the 13th day of May, A. D. 1846; that he graduated at West Point, in the State of New York, about the 30th day of June, A. D. 1843, and continued in actual service during the entire period of the war, as will be shown by the muster rolls of the field and staff of the Fourth Regiment of United States Infantry.

He makes this declaration for the purpose of obtaining the bounty lands to which he may be entitled under the "act granting bounty lands to certain officers and soldiers who have been engaged in the military service of the United States," passed September 28, 1850.

U. S. GRANT,

1st Lt. & R. Q. M., 4th Inf.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,

County of Wayne, ss:

I, Silas A. Bagg, clerk of said county of Wayne, do hereby certify that George Clancy, whose name is subscribed to the affidavit of the annexed instrument and therein written, was, at the time of taking affidavit, a justice of the peace for said county, duly elected and qualified, and duly authorized to take the affidavit. And further, that I am well acquainted with the handwriting of such justice and verily believe that the signature to the said jurat is genuine.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said county at the city of Detroit this 6th day of November, A. D. 1850.

DETROIT, MICH., November 6, 1850.

SIR: Will you please forward me my land warrant on the inclosed certificate? I am, sir,

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

U. S. GRANT,

1st Lt. & R. Q. M., 4th Inf.

To JAS. L. EDWARDS,

Commissioner of Pensions.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,

Sangamon County, ss:

On this 21st day of August, A. D. 1855, personally appeared before me, a justice of the peace within and for the county and State aforesaid, Abraham Lincoln, aged 46 years, a resident of Sangamon County in the State of Illinois, who, being duly sworn according to law, declares that he is the identical Abraham Lincoln who was captain of a company in the regiment of Illinois Mounted Volunteers, commanded by Col. Samuel M. Thompson, in the war with the British band of Sacs and other tribes of Indians on our northwestern frontier in A. D. 1832, known as the Black Hawk War. That he volunteered at the State and county aforesaid on or about the 21st day of April, 1832, for no definite time and continued in actual service in said war for about 40 days; that he has heretofore made application for bounty land under the act of September 28, 1850, and received a land warrant, No. 52076, for forty (40) acres, which he has since located and can not now return.

He makes this declaration for the purpose of obtaining the additional bounty land to which he may be entitled under the act approved the 3d day of March, 1855. He also declares that he has never applied for nor received, under this or any other act of Congress, any bounty land warrant except the one above mentioned.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Mr. COPELAND. So, Mr. President, famous men—Sheridan, Sherman, Scott, Farragut, Lee, Grant, Lincoln, and many others—applied for what was equivalent to adjusted compensation.

Are there any greater names in American history than these? Is there any one who doubts the patriotic devotion of each of these men to the cause he fought for and for which he was willing to die? Can any shame attach to any one of these heroes in American history if he applied for the bonus or bounty granted by an appreciative Government, or was his honor tarnished?

Shame on the man who seeks to bring discredit upon the young heroes who went out to battle at the call of our country. Shame on the Government which forgets to care for these men in a decent way and to adjust in some degree at least the difference between the paltry wage paid and the amount they might have received in civil life.

For myself I am willing to submit my action in voting for a bonus bill to the ultimate decision of my people, because I believe their action will coincide with the sentiments of their generous and loyal hearts.

I am convinced there is no surer way to attract widespread attention than to attempt to empty or to replenish the national or private pocketbook. The eyes of the Nation are on the Congress to see what will be its attitude on tax reduction and the bonus. If I am any judge, there is not a single indifferent person in the United States, certainly not within the boundaries of the State of New York.

In the discussion of these subjects I have been amazed by the exhibitions of temper, combativeness, and violence on the part of persons whom I have regarded as models of Christian virtue. Men I have looked upon as saints have shown their teeth like hungry wolves. If I were not in possession of written proof, I could not be made to believe that men and women, rich beyond the dreams of ordinary ambition, and generous in almsgiving and other good deeds, could be so downright selfish, sordid, and grasping. It is beyond all credit. No wonder Saint Paul said, "the love of money is the root of all evil." The money changers in the temple were not worse than have been some of my correspondents of the past few days.

Representing a constituency equal to 18 States I could name and, in consequence, a population exceeding that looked after collectively by a very large percentage of my colleagues in this Chamber, you can believe that my mail just now is burdensome to the postal authorities and impossible of adequate attention by the limited staff assigned a Senator.

I represent a constituency which pays considerably more than one-quarter of the Nation's taxes. Certainly there can be no section of the country more interested in taxation than the citizens of New York State.

Of course, I should be more impressed by the cloud of letters I have received were it not for the fact that so many of them are not the result of voluntary desire to express an idea. It is very apparent that thousands of them are inspired by specially interested parties. On the desk before me are 500 letters, written on the one typewriter, on the same stationery, and mailed from the same post office, many at the same hour. They give identical advice.

I would like in that connection to read a few of these letters. I have, for instance, this letter:

A number of corporations are sending letters to their employees asking them to sign their names to petitions which they, the corporations, will fill in in opposing the bonus and boosting tax reduction. These employees against their desire are doing this in fear of losing their positions. These men are asked to send these letters to the corporations, and said corporations are mailing them. Any man whose name is not on the petition they send is marked, no doubt, for dismissal. Mr. COPELAND, do not let this frightful propaganda influence you. Our family has confidence in you.

I am glad of that.

Then I have here a double postal card. Somehow or other the double one got into my mail because it miscarried and did not go to the man for whom it was intended. It reads as follows:

NEW YORK CITY, January 4, 1924.

DEAR SIR: Senator COPELAND has announced that he will address the Senate on the bonus and tax questions Tuesday, January 8. We urge you as a veteran and one of his constituents to give him the benefit of your views on the bonus question.

Write him immediately on the attached post card, so that he will receive it before Tuesday. His address is: Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Do it now.

EX-SERVICE MEN'S ANTI-BONUS LEAGUE.

As a result of this propaganda, I received over 1,200 of these return postal cards. Of course I am not disturbed by this cloud of letters. They are not all in opposition. I have many which are friendly in tone.

I would like to say one word more about the letters which came in such number. A friend of mine, a doctor in Brooklyn, wrote me asking me to vote against the bonus and for the tax reduction. He happened to inclose a printed slip. I wrote and asked where it came from. He replied, "You are probably aware by this time that there has been a general notice sent out to all stockholders and bondholders in the entire State of New York to write the Member of Congress against the bonus." In one mail last Saturday I received 1,500 letters inspired by these same corporate interests. But, as I have said, I have had some of a different tone, and I want to read into the RECORD parts of two or three of these. I read:

I sincerely trust that the tirades thrust at you by the newspapers, whose owners will be the chief beneficiaries under the Mellon plan, will not alter your decision to see that the soldier who fought and won the war receives a fair deal.

You no doubt have received numerous letters from captains, majors, colonels, flight commanders, and others with exalted rank decrying the bonus bill and asking for passage of the Mellon tax cut. Most of these gentlemen received more compensation during the war than they were ever able to earn in civil life, while others, recruited from college, had no earning capacity whatsoever prior to the war. These latter are probably now in the tax-paying class and are enveloped in the smoke screen thrown out by Mr. Mellon to the small fry in order to have them board the band wagon.

The war—that is, the bloody, maiming part of it—was fought by the privates, corporals, and others of noncommissioned rank, who received the munificent remuneration of from \$33 to about \$50 per month. From this amount the sum of \$6.50 to \$7 was deducted for insurance, and in some instances \$5 was also deducted to pay for Liberty bonds purchased while in this country. And the slackers, stay-at-homes, and profiteers were waxing fat on the Government's money. It is the above type of soldier who believes that he was not given a fair deal, and although many of them can not even write to their representatives for lack of education, they are nevertheless keeping a keen eye on the present situation to see if big business, private capital, and selfish partisans are again to exercise their malign influence over our national legislation.

Our country loaned billions of dollars to foreign powers, with which they paid bonuses to their soldiers; yea, some of them are even using it to further their military ambitions. The Dominion of Canada handled the question in a straightforward manner, and as a result their valiant soldiers are grateful and will prove to be even better citizens.

Here is a letter written by the vice commander of one of the posts in Brooklyn:

A great many of us feel we are getting a "raw deal" from the majority of the press, when it is understood that 50 per cent of the men examined during the war were rejected, due to venereal diseases and other diseases, and allowed to earn from \$6 to \$20 a day, while the men who kept themselves clean were taken and given a dollar a day, less allotments and insurance, to defend the Nation.

As a doctor, I am sure you realize more than anyone else that good governments are built by clean men. The men who went over sacrificed more than the entire wealth of the country could pay, if a price could be set. The American Legion has put itself on record as favoring a justified adjustment, and it should be passed if the Government wishes to go on record as being in favor of justice and moral citizenship.

A letter received this morning was from a woman, and, by the way, out of the 10,000 which I have received against the bonus I have not had 25 letters from women. The women of the country, in my judgment, are in favor of the bonus. This lady wrote as follows:

Hearing that you are going to speak on the bonus bill on January 8, I wish to express a few views on the subject.

If the bill does not go through, it will be because the wealthy men of the country, who do not need a bonus, are selfishly fighting against it for their own interests, and are contributing large sums to the antibonus league to fight it, while the poorer class, which is in the majority for the bonus, can not express their views because they can not put money into a league to fight for themselves. Is this country going to be run by the wealthy man and his opinion, or is it to be for the people, by the people, etc.? The fellows that did the hardest fighting are the ones who need the bonus, and they are the middle-class men, the backbone of our country, the men that put you where you are.

Every ex-service man who is not wealthy feels in his heart that he would like to get a bonus, even those who say they don't want any, and he is not unpatriotic in his opinion. He deserves it, and he should get it. Won't you help the boys?

As long as this matter was brought up, it should be disposed of justly, so that our boys do not have a grievance. They should be made to feel that the best is being done for them.

Mr. President, in my judgment the feeling of the veteran at present is that the best is not being done for them.

But I am not frightened by the outbursts in the letters I have received. I have faith in the sense of justice and fair play possessed by New Yorkers and by the American people. It may be delayed in its manifestations, but ultimately it comes to the surface. When once our citizens know the truth about these questions there will be a reasonable degree of harmony, I am sure. Not everybody can be satisfied, perhaps, but at least everybody will be sure those in authority have done the best they could to please discordant and irreconcilable groups.

Mr. Mellon presented a plan of tax reduction which struck a responsive chord in every heart. All of us have suffered the effects of high taxation. His message came like a bolt from the blue. It illuminated the whole horizon and gave us visions of easier living and perhaps of many luxuries which have been denied us since the war.

I regret that the Secretary of the Treasury associated the two questions in his message to the House. In spite of all Mr. Mellon has said, and in spite of all the editorials and personal letters I have read, I deny that the two questions are so related that one must die if the other lives.

Unfortunately for our ex-soldiers, Mr. Mellon, played upon I suppose by the bitter opponents of the bonus, wrote a peroration to his welcome speech. He said: "A soldier's bonus would postpone tax reduction not for one but for many years to come." He attempted to sandbag the bonus, using a formidable weapon—the pocketbook of the Nation.

The amazing thing is that Mr. Mellon appears to speak ex cathedra. Anything from his lips or pen, or said to be from his lips or pen, is accepted as inspired. How ridiculous!

Because he is a great banker and a very valuable executive in a department made up of experts who stay there permanently, is it necessary to accept his personal views on this question as the last word? Certainly not.

We may or may not accept his argument. I do not accept his conclusions in full, nor, I believe, will the country when it gets all the facts.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Last year when the Secretary of the Treasury was making his report to the Congress he estimated that there would be a deficit in the revenues of last year amounting to something over \$800,000,000. The final result was a surplus of about \$300,000,000. Undoubtedly those estimates were made by the distinguished Secretary inspired by his feeling of cautiousness. Is it not possible, therefore, that all of the statements of the Secretary with reference to the present financial condition of the Treasury might be considered by us as somewhat in connection with his estimate of revenue for last year?

Mr. COPELAND. I fully agree with the statement of the Senator.

There can be no doubt that the Nation has its mouth set for a tax reduction of \$323,000,000. That is the amount Mr. Mellon named, and that is the amount everybody says we must have. All right, let us have it.

The suggestion makes a pleasant sound in my ears, because it will give my family several hundred extra dollars to spend.

Here is the statement I have made to many thousands of persons who have written me about the reduction of taxation:

I have carefully studied Secretary Mellon's proposals and believe it possible to carry out every detail of his plan, and yet pass a reasonable bonus measure, which I also heartily favor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand Mr. Mellon is now contending that the taxes upon incomes are so high that we do not realize as much revenue from them as we would if they were lower, and yet, according to Mr. Mellon's own statement, which has been referred to by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], the present law, instead of yielding the deficit which he estimated of \$800,000,000, yielded a surplus of \$400,000,000, which would indicate that the present income tax law is a very good revenue-producing system.

Mr. COPELAND. That also gives encouragement to me, I may say to the Senator from North Carolina. Since Mr. Mellon was so conservative then that he underestimated by \$400,000,000 the income of the Government, we may safely accept his statement that there will be no loss from the reduction in the surtaxes under the proposed new law. Therefore, we will have the \$102,000,000 and, perhaps, in addition to it the millions suggested by the Senator from North Carolina, although the promised amount will be sufficient to pay the bonus.

It is easily proven by Mr. Mellon's own words that my statement is well founded, provided his statements are equally well founded.

In writing to Congressman GREEN, Secretary Mellon recommends to the Ways and Means Committee of the House that the surtax rates be reduced "by commencing their application

at \$10,000 instead of \$6,000, and scaling these progressively upward to 25 per cent at \$100,000."

What effect will this feature of Mr. Mellon's plan have on the actual tax receipts of the Government? His estimate of decreased revenue includes one hundred and two millions of loss from this reduction in the surtaxes. The three hundred and twenty-three millions total reduction in taxation which he proposes includes this one hundred and two millions.

It has been drilled into the ears of the country that the more prosperous taxpayers, persons with net incomes of from \$10,000 up to \$100,000, and, of course, from that amount up to an annual net income of a million dollars or two—it has been said that by reason of the tax reduction on such incomes the Government will lose one hundred and two millions from this one source.

Mr. Mellon confesses that the powerful United States Government has been impotent to collect from these shrewd millionaires, and instead of finding ways to legally collect upon these incomes he proposes to dilute the law, and asks that the United States cut the tax in two in order that it may be enforced at all.

Are you proud of an administration so weak that it confesses its inability to collect taxes from the very men best able to pay them?

Were I a member of the administration I should be ashamed to confess that no way has been found to bring this capital into productive business or otherwise force it to pay its just share of the costs of government. The parable of the talents gives the penalty which is meted out to him who wraps his talent in a napkin, leaving it incapable of increase.

However, let us leave this phase of the subject and for the moment accept Mr. Mellon's plan at the high estimate placed upon it by the thousands who have written to the Members of the Senate. Let us take the Secretary's very words and see what he considers will be the effect of the reduction in the surtax.

I shall now quote from Mr. Mellon's letter to Mr. GREEN. On page 2 of the third item, on the reduction of surtaxes, he makes some comments to which I wish to refer. Senators need not accept any statement I may make, but here is what Mr. Mellon himself says of this reduction:

In the long run, it will mean higher rather than lower revenues from the surtaxes.

Mr. Mellon also said:

The reduced rates will soon equal or exceed what would accrue at the present rates, because of the encouragement which the changes will give to productive business.

I hope everything he promises will actually take place. If he is conservative as usual there will be millions more than he estimates.

So, you see, Mr. Mellon has left us \$102,000,000; or, if he is a prophet and a financial seer, there will be considerably more than this amount of increase. The trouble with the man in the street is that he is apt to base his curbstone computations on brief summaries and not on detailed recommendations. From that man Mr. Mellon has carefully hidden away money enough to pay a decent bonus. If this is found out, Mr. President, there will be a cry from the grasping that Mr. Mellon's plan is a failure, because it did not provide for giving up to the big taxpayer more of Uncle Sam's receipts.

Here we have a hundred and two millions annually. Let us use this as the basis for a bonus measure. If a bonus can be provided at a total cost of not to exceed this amount annually, it can be paid, and yet, as I have said to each of my correspondents, every detail of Secretary Mellon's plan can be carried out.

You have heard the most exaggerated and disturbing figures about the cost of a bonus. I have in my hand the New York Times for Sunday, January 6, reporting a speech made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. For the Senator from Idaho personally I have real affection, and I take second place to no man in this Chamber in my respect for his statesmanship, but the Senator from Idaho has been terribly played upon undoubtedly by statements which have been given out by Mr. Mellon himself. What does the Senator from Idaho say in this speech. He says:

There is no avoiding or sidestepping this issue; one is either for tax reduction or he is against it. One has a right to be for the bonus or he has the right to be for tax reduction. But you can not be for both.

You can not take off a temporary burden of \$140,000,000 or \$150,000,000 and lay on a permanent burden or obligation of \$4,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000 and call it tax reduction.

Undoubtedly the Senator from Idaho founded that on the statements made by Mr. Mellon. I have here the current number of the Saturday Evening Post in which there is an authorized interview with Mr. Mellon, an interview written by David Lawrence. Mr. Lawrence asked this question of Mr. Mellon:

"Do you suppose a plan of Mr. McAdoo—namely, a 50-year bond issue—would work?" I inquired.

"Those bonds would have to be paid off some day," said Mr. Mellon, "and we would have to provide interest annually as well as a sinking fund to take care of the principal. Where would the money come from for the interest and the sinking fund?"

"To illustrate my point let us assume that the total cost of the bonus is to be about \$4,000,000,000. We could not borrow that much at less than 5 per cent. That means an annual interest charge of \$200,000,000. On top of that there should be a sinking fund of at least \$60,000,000; so the total annual cost is about \$260,000,000. Think of what the addition of such an item of expense would be to our Budget! It would almost wipe out our surplus of \$300,000,000."

What nonsense that is. What did Mr. McAdoo really say? I have here the Washington Daily News of January 4, containing an article signed by Mr. McAdoo, the heading being "McAdoo says taxes can be cut and bonus paid too." I read this as Mr. McAdoo's opinion:

I favor paying the bonus in cash and getting it behind us. This can be done by issuing 50-year bonds for the required amount. The interest charge, including a sufficient sinking-fund provision at 5 per cent, will be \$77,400,000 per annum.

Deduct this from the \$323,000,000 tax reduction proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury and we have a net reduction in taxes of \$245,600,000, and the soldiers' bonus will be disposed of with justice to the men and honor to the country.

Personally I think we can do very much better than that; but my contention is that Mr. Mellon's reply to Mr. McAdoo was not a fair reply and did not properly state what Mr. McAdoo had said with reference to the bonus. Likewise it misled the Senator from Idaho.

I want you to have the actual figures of what it would cost to adjust the compensation of the veterans and to pay it in cash, which is the kind of a bonus I consider to be reasonable and just.

If I present figures which seem very elementary, I hope you will forgive me, Mr. President, because I wish to make my position as clear as possible not only to you but to others who may be interested.

In the army of the World War there were 4,679,853 men. Of these, 2,435,000 served overseas. The remaining 2,244,853 were denied the privilege of leaving these shores.

The average number of days served by each man in the home service was 260½. The average for the men who had overseas service was 333½ days.

The bonus bills, such as were proposed at the last session and which have been reintroduced at the present session, provide a dollar a day for home service, or a total in round numbers of \$585,000,000. They provide for overseas men a dollar and a quarter a day, or a total of a trifle over \$1,000,000,000. Deducting the \$60 each man did receive on his discharge, the total cost of a cash bonus on this plan would be \$1,318,575,600.

Personally I am not quite satisfied with this plan, because it marks a difference between the men who went to Europe and the men who were detained here. In my judgment, in the last analysis the sacrifice was the same for each group. If I had my way, I should add 25 cents a day to the home-service group, giving these men a dollar and a quarter a day, the same as the overseas veterans. This would place all the ex-service men on the same plane of equality, just as they have chosen to be in the Legion.

This extra payment to the home-service men would increase the bonus by \$146,201,663. This would make the whole amount due the veterans on the cash-payment plan not \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000, as suggested by Mr. Mellon and many others who have talked about it, but, Mr. President, the entire amount due the veterans on a cash payment plan, giving every man a dollar and a quarter for every day of service, would be \$1,464,777,263.

This is considerably less than a billion and a half of dollars. It is a modest sum in comparison with a total cost of twenty-five billions for the war. It is less than any one of the major European countries owes us. Yet this sum, a billion and a half, would adjust the compensation of every veteran, and it can be cared for out of the more productive income prophesied by Mr. Mellon as a result of the reduced surtaxes.

Suppose this money, amounting to \$1,500,000,000, were borrowed in 60-year bonds, issuing the billion and a half at once,

or if the bonus is paid in five equal annual installments, in issues of three hundred millions annually for five years, the total interest cost at the high rate of 5 per cent, which is suggested by Mr. Mellon in his interview, would be less than seventy-five millions per year.

Twenty-five millions paid annually to retire the bonds would make a total expense to the country the first year for interest and principal of \$100,000,000, and this would decrease annually till the debt was wiped out at the end of 60 years.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED of Pennsylvania in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I think it may be advisable at this point to suggest another source of revenue which I have not heard mentioned. The Senator will recall that in the revenue bill we created a sinking fund for the present indebtedness of the country, being, as I recall, 2½ per cent of all the indebtedness outstanding. When that provision was enacted we assumed that that would be quite ample for retirement purposes. Since that time we have settled our indebtedness with Great Britain, under which settlement payments of something like \$165,000,000 are to be made each year. In that settlement it was provided that the annual payments might be made in bonds of the United States, and, as a matter of fact, that is what is being done. So the present funded indebtedness of the country is being retired not only at the rate which Congress thought was advisable but by the additional amount of more than \$160,000,000 a year. If, therefore, the Secretary of the Treasury wanted to find some means of supplying the funds for this adjusted compensation, could he not very well provide that an amount out of the sinking fund which would be replaced by the bonds bought by Great Britain and turned over to this Government should be applied to this purpose and in that way take care of the new bond issue which might be made necessary for the purpose of paying the adjusted compensation?

Mr. COPELAND. I agree fully with the Senator, and I believe that if the bonus payments were made in five annual installments there never would be a bond sold; the money to pay it could be received from the ordinary operations of the Government.

This is a simple problem in arithmetic and one need not be a great banker to understand it. Even a doctor can understand it! Mr. Mellon's one hundred and two millions of increased revenues, which he promises if the surtaxes of the rich are reduced, will pay the entire cost of the bonus and give us the \$323,000,000 reduction he is talking about and which the country is demanding.

The argument against the bond issue is that it would upset the refunding operations of the Treasury. This is absurd. In a rich country like ours there is something wrong with officials who can not dispose of an additional billion and a half of securities without national disaster. Come to New York State, Mr. Secretary. We have nine and a half billions on deposit in our savings banks alone.

My conference of recent days with famous financiers have made me most sanguine of what can be done with the Treasury under present conditions. It is very probable that a bill could be framed which would help the ordinary citizen far and away more than Mr. Mellon proposes, and I understand such a bill has been framed by our colleagues of the minority on the other side, a bill which deserves study and consideration. The amount of the exemption could be increased and the smaller taxpayers could be given under such a plan a larger measure of relief.

However, it is not my purpose at this time to propose a tax bill, but to show the country that the Mellon plan can be made effective in every detail and a reasonable cash bonus be paid as well.

Some Senator may ask what will happen if Mr. Mellon does not prove to be the financial seer we are told he is and the \$102,000,000 additional revenue he promises is not realized. Of course, nobody is apt to ask that from the other side, because Mr. Mellon is looked upon as the last word on this subject; but suppose he should fall us this time, and the \$102,000,000 additional revenue he promises be not realized.

The answer is simple: If the Mellon plan does not work, the surtaxes will be restored, because the bonus must be paid.

Fortunately, Mr. Mellon shows how it can be paid.

Of course, the Mellon plan was not written to provide a bonus. Its real purpose is to reduce the surtaxes on the rich. Their taxes are cut in half, from 50 to 25 per cent. The rest

of us, as usual, under a Republican administration, get only the crumbs. And so insistent is Mr. Mellon on a big cut in the surtaxes, a reduction from 50 to 25 per cent, that he refuses to take anything less, refuses to compromise at 35 per cent, threatening to withdraw his bill if the compromise is urged. If press reports can be relied upon, the President shares his views.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit a little further interruption in connection with his remark that the Secretary proposes to reduce the taxes of the rich by half, I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that his statement is corroborated by what was done in the passage of the last revenue bill. There the so-called excess-profits taxes were repealed; and I find upon an examination of the tax returns for the year 1921, which was a year of adversity to a great many corporations, that notwithstanding the very adverse conditions which prevailed in industry during that year, the last one for which excess-profits taxes were paid, the amount of the excess-profits taxes was just about one-half of all the taxes paid by corporations. So by the repeal of the excess-profits taxes he in fact did reduce the taxes upon corporations by 50 per cent, and now he seeks to reduce the taxes upon individual incomes by about the same rate.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator. I fully agree with him.

Great business men with whom I have discussed the matter in New York, reluctantly admitting that the bonus must be paid, have begged me to "get it out of the way in one lump." With this in mind I shall present in due time a bonus bill, providing for immediate cash payments such as I have outlined.

May I ask you to bear with me a bit further?

Assuming that the bonus will be paid in cash, when it comes to providing the funds I am unalterably opposed to the issuance of tax-exempt securities.

It is time for the Federal Government to give the country an example of the proper methods of financing public projects. We have had enough in Government of what has come to be called "high finance." We need some old-fashioned "low finance."

What a shame it is that this evil has grown until the financial pages of our newspapers are filled with advertisements of tax-exempt securities. No political subdivision is so infinitesimal that it can not issue tax-exempt bonds, "proper investments for estates," etc.

There is something wrong with government when there is no means of reaching for purposes of taxation vast fortunes hidden away in these alluring investments. This bad practice must be ended at once.

I am not a lawyer. To my lay mind it seems as if laws should mean what they say. When I read the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution it gives me a vivid vision of what should be reality, but which great lawyers tell me is merely a mirage.

One has but to read the history of our country to know how much the question of taxation has had to do with our evolution as a Nation. It remains with us as one of the greatest of our problems. Witness the upheaval of the past few weeks. On everybody's tongue is the discussion of taxation and the use of the common funds.

There is universal discontent regarding the construction placed on the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution. The average man reads that article and it is so clear that it seems to him the wayfaring man though a fool need not err therein.

Listen to it:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

When the income from municipal or county bonds is converted into money in the pocket, where it is mixed with money derived from profits on the operation of a railroad, a layman can not understand why one handful of coin is sacred and another handful is a proper object of the National Government's powers of taxation.

Of course, I am familiar with the legal argument, but I submit, even in the presence of the great lawyers of this Senate, that common sense is sometimes more potent than legal hair splitting.

I wrote Prof. Edward S. Corwin, professor of politics and jurisprudence in Princeton University, successor there to the chair of Woodrow Wilson, to ask him if he would write me briefly his opinion on the tax-exempt securities. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL TAX EXEMPTION.

1. The exemption of national securities from local taxation: Congress has the power to "borrow money upon the credit of the United States" and to pass "any laws which shall be necessary and proper" for making this power effective. (Art. I, sec. 8, pars. 2 and 18.) By the weight of authority the exemption of national securities from local taxation is implied in the acts under which such securities have been issued. Naturally Congress could forestall the reading of such an implication into its acts by specifying to the contrary.

National securities in the hands of private investors are private property and should be subject as such to nondiscriminatory taxes of all kinds, both national and local. Any local enactment selecting such holdings for special burdens would be void on the face of it.

2. The exemption of incomes derived from State and municipal bonds from national taxation: The taxing power of Congress was originally plenary. (*Hylton v. U. S.*, 2 Dall. 1796.) Nearly 100 years later it was ruled, on the basis of most extravagant and far-fetched reasoning, that a national income tax could not reach incomes derived from State and municipal bonds. (*Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.*, 25 Pollock, 158 U. S., based on *Collector v. Day*, 11 Wall. 1871.) This was on the theory that such bonds remain instrumentalities of the State, even in the hands of the private investor. But, even admitting this theory, it does not apply to the income from such bonds. Anyway, this doctrine has now been abolished by the sixteenth amendment which empowers Congress to tax incomes "from whatever source derived." There are some judicial dicta that these words do not "enlarge" Congress's power of income taxation, and this is true in a sense. For the words quoted only restore Congress its original powers, and they do this, not by a regnant of powers but rather by forbidding the line of reasoning whereby the court took away some of these powers. Henceforth incomes are to be treated as incomes regardless of source; or, to put it otherwise, the scope of Congress's power in the taxation of incomes is not to be delimited henceforth by a consideration of the source of such incomes.

On the dicta, referred to above, only one requires special consideration. In *Evans v. Gore* (253 U. S.) the court held that the general income tax could not be applied to the official salary of a Federal judge already in office when the tax was levied, that so to apply it would diminish said salary contrary to the prohibition in Article III, section 1; and the court added that this was so despite the sixteenth amendment, since this did not extend Congress's power to forbidden subject matter, but only removed the necessity for levying income taxes by the rule of apportionment.

This utterance, however, has absolutely no bearing on the case of incomes from State and municipal bonds for this reason: Admitting *Evans v. Gore* to have been properly decided, the exemption there recognized was not due to the source of the income but to a special constitutional safeguard thrown around the recipient of the income involved; whereas the exemption of incomes derived from State and municipal bonds has been due, not to any consideration of the merits or necessities of the recipients of such incomes, but solely to a consideration of the source of such incomes; and the sixteenth amendment now forbids absolutely any consideration of the source of incomes for the purpose of limiting Congress's power of taxation of incomes.

In short, *Evans v. Gore* has no bearing on the present question; and the sixteenth amendment means just what it says. It ought to be added that by all the rules of constitutional and statutory construction, when the literal meaning of a provision is clear, it is entitled to prevail. As the court remarks in a recent case, interpretation is to be resorted to for the purpose of removing obscurities, not for the purpose of importing them. (*Russell Motor Car Co. v. United States*, decided Apr. 9, 1923.)

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

For the Hon. R. S. COPELAND,

United States Senate, January 4, 1924.

Mr. COPELAND. The President, in his message, repeats what Mr. Mellon said a month before, that an amendment to the Constitution is the only way to wipe out the curse of tax-exempt securities.

That is the accepted idea, but I should like to say in passing that I hope some expert in English and in law can be secured to formulate the proposed amendment to make certain this time that the constitutional clause will mean what it says!

To go through all the moves necessary to amend the Constitution will take several years. In the meantime let us do our part to place this issue squarely before the Supreme Court, in the hope that our action might result in a decision favorable to the people of America.

If Congress instructed the Treasury Department to demand returns on incomes derived from all securities hereafter issued, it would so frighten the financial world that new tax-exempt securities would be a drug on the market. In my opinion, that

action on the part of Congress would have exactly the same effect as an amendment to the Constitution.

Of course, I do not oppose the suggested amendment, which can be had, too, but my plan is at least two years faster than the President's.

I should be opposed to any effort to tax existing exempt securities. To do so would not be fair to present owners, and undoubtedly the attempt would be defeated in the courts; but the Congress should make plain to the country that it disapproves the further authorization of such securities. There can be no doubt they have contributed to reckless extravagances. It is time to warn our citizens that public debts should be reduced. If the debts of the world—international, national, State, and local—were added together, the man power of the earth could not pay the interest. It is time to call a halt on reckless spending and easy borrowing.

I pledge for myself that I shall stand against every inexcusable proposal for expenditure of the public funds. This is the time to reduce expenses and to reduce taxes. I favor much in the Mellon plan. It has ancestry I admire—its Democratic forefathers—but also I like it for itself and for the good it will do our country. Every Democratic Secretary of the Treasury since the termination of the war has recommended tax reduction, and a reduction more liberal to the masses of taxpayers than this particular bill provides. But the idea of tax reduction belongs to no distinctive school of political economy, nor is it any new discovery in governmental power or principle. The idea of tax reduction is native to every heart, and under no circumstances should it be made a party measure.

But, mark you, I shall not be stamped into voting for this measure, good as it is, or any other tax measure, unless we show our sincerity as regards the veterans. They have been neglected too long. Before we are generous to ourselves we must be just to them.

I warn the Senate. My contact with the masses teaches me at least one thing—the American people will not smile upon this body if from its abundance of riches it fails to deal decently with those brave lads who did for us in the Great War what we could not do for ourselves.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. EDGE obtained the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. EDGE. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I observe that during the remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], discussing the two vital issues of the bonus and taxation, the other side of the Chamber became empty. There are now only three Senators sitting over there. I wish to suggest to the Senator from New Jersey, before he begins to discuss these vital questions, that we have a roll call in order that the Republicans may come back into their seats and hear the discussion. They absented themselves when the questions were being discussed by a Senator on this side, which would indicate that they did not desire to hear any discussion from this side of the Chamber. Perhaps they will desire to hear something from the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. EDGE. So far as I am personally concerned, I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from North Carolina; but I recognize that Senators are very busy; that they have many other responsibilities and obligations; and I am entirely satisfied to address the Chair and give them the privilege, if they desire to follow my remarks, or reading them in the RECORD the next day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the suggestion of the Senator from North Carolina that there is an absence of a quorum?

Mr. EDGE. I did not understand that the Senator from North Carolina made that suggestion.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator from New Jersey does not desire the presence of his colleagues, I withdraw the suggestion of a roll call to secure the presence of a quorum.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I did not understand the Senator from North Carolina to suggest the absence of a quorum. I think by his remarks he merely suggested the absence of Senators on the Republican side of the Chamber.

I propose to discuss taxes, as I said at the outset, not tax reduction, however, but tax consumption. The surest way to reduce taxes, in my judgment, is to cut down expenditures. It requires rather a modern system of accounting to be able to add to our expenditures and at the same time cut down the levy of taxes on the public. Surpluses which may temporarily exist have a habit somehow of very rapidly diminishing, and can not be depended upon or go very far, at least, to pay new obligations. I am going to take about 20 minutes of the time of the Senate to discuss what I consider a very pertinent ques-

tion at this time, a subject which, from all accounts, reading the daily press, will require the almost immediate consideration of the Senate, and a subject which involves the expenditure of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. In my judgment, unless a businesslike, common-sense solution is found to the problem the great deficit we are now annually facing will increase instead of diminish. I refer to the problem of the merchant marine.

There has been considerable discussion in the last few days of a suggested new policy in connection with the administration of the merchant marine, and in this connection I understand the new president of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, whose powers under the revised plan announced will be greatly increased, has been or is soon to be appointed.

I want to compliment the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee [Senator JONES], whom I see in the Chamber, for his highly intelligent and constructive service in endeavoring to encourage the perpetuation of an American merchant marine. I have been a member of the Committee on Commerce, which is charged with responsibility in that matter, ever since I came into the Senate, and I am convinced there is no problem of the Government to-day more difficult of solution, and, because of the huge expenditures involved, no one where it is more necessary for the introduction of recognized business methods combined with an uncompromising executive control.

As an unswerving advocate of an American merchant marine, and after years of attempted administration, I am convinced we have arrived at the time when a radical change in policy is absolutely imperative. I do not propose to consume any time in speaking of the necessity of an American merchant marine both in times of peace and in times of war. A well rounded out and equipped merchant marine is so essential I assume there is little if any difference of opinion in this regard.

My discussion to-day will be confined therefore to the problems of administration, especially in view of these recent suggested changes in policies, and with some recommendations which I trust will at least furnish food for careful thought and reflection.

I assume there are some Senators who conscientiously believe that continued Government administration would be the wisest policy to pursue, who are convinced that the merchant marine should always be a direct branch of the Government service. My position, however, is that of one who is fundamentally opposed to Government administration of any business that can be developed through the energy and enterprise of our citizens, and one who accepted literally section 5 of the revised merchant marine act of 1920.

Subdivision A of this section reads as follows:

That in order to accomplish the declared purposes of this act and to carry out the policy declared in section 1 hereof the board is authorized and directed to sell, as soon as practicable, consistent with good business methods and the objects and purposes to be attained by this act, at public or private competitive sale, after appraisalment and due advertisement in at least one daily newspaper in such principal ports in the United States and in such leading shipping periodicals as the board deems advisable, to persons who are citizens of the United States, except as provided in section 6 of this act, all the vessels referred to in section 4 of this act or otherwise acquired by the board.

I might say, in passing, that the vessels referred to in section 6 of the act are naval vessels which might temporarily be assigned to the Shipping Board, and, of course, should not be for sale.

I fully appreciate that this law permits a very wide latitude, and am thoroughly familiar with the fact that while it has seemed to have been the desire to turn the merchant marine over to private administration, little real progress in this direction has been made. I fully realize and appreciate that those in authority have found it very difficult to carry out the direction to sell as contained in the section I have just read, due almost entirely to two reasons:

First, that since the act of 1920 was passed there has been a very considerable excess of ocean-going tonnage over world requirements.

Second, that American-flag vessels can not operate, due to our higher standards of wages, etc., as economically as the merchant ships of other nations.

However, after fully considering these facts, I am still convinced that the position of our merchant marine can be greatly improved, and that the time has arrived when further consideration must be given to the problem, so as to enable the Government to save to its taxpayers some of the approximately \$50,000,000 annual deficit they are now contributing.

About a year ago Congress refused to grant a carefully prepared, businesslike subsidy, which was devised for the purpose

of meeting the handicaps under which American ships were obliged to operate, and by so doing make possible their sale to American owners and operators, and in this way build up a permanent merchant marine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator mean by his statement regarding the \$50,000,000 deficit to imply that that is the only loss? I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that large sums are being derived by the Shipping Board from the sale of various vessels, all of which, of course, is money lost; that there is constant depreciation and deterioration of capital and of investment, all of which is lost, and which is an indirect charge upon the Treasury, for the reason that heretofore we have made appropriations covering these sums. So that while we may appropriate now only \$50,000,000 directly out of the Treasury there is an actual loss in depreciation and in the destruction of capital heretofore invested of perhaps fifty to seventy-five million dollars more. So that the way the Shipping Board is operating now, it is only a question of a few years when the entire four billions of capital will have been consumed and destroyed, plus whatever appropriations we make from year to year.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his suggestion. Later I will touch upon the thought he has brought to the attention of the Senate.

While the bill providing the subsidy was not permitted to come to a vote, still whatever the method employed, it failed to become a law. We must, therefore, face the problem with a realization that a subsidy has been denied.

What is the result? As stated, a deficit of approximately \$50,000,000 a year which, of course, must be made up by the taxpayers of the country, and is in itself a clear form of subsidy. Yes, a subsidy without having the advantage of encouraging American shipowners and operators to engage in the business we all stress so much.

And that is not all. If our ships are to be operated in the world's trade and not limited to those reserved exclusively to American ships, such as our coastwise, we have no alternative but to build ships. We must recognize that new vessels of up-to-date design must continually be added. Take for example the North Atlantic service in which we now have only one modern and up-to-date vessel, the *Leviathan*. Practical shipping people whom I have consulted tell me that before we can hope to compete with the British and operate under the American flag a fast trans-Atlantic mail and passenger service, it is essential to supplement the *Leviathan* with two new vessels of her class. Is the money necessary to the carrying on of a construction program to be borne, as is the present deficit, by the taxpayer? For if not, then certainly it is high time that a decision should be reached as to whether the act of 1920 means what it says, that the fleet shall go into private hands, or that we are prepared to continue to maintain, at an enormous loss for all time to come, a Government-owned and administered merchant marine.

Permit me to discuss very briefly the present financial situation, and after bringing that picture before you, I will try to suggest some remedies. It has always been my conviction that it is the duty of anyone in or out of public life, when criticizing an existing state of affairs, to be constructive as well as critical.

From the best sources available, although I must freely admit accurate figures are unobtainable, it is estimated that the merchant marine originally cost the American people something over \$3,000,000,000. This includes ships, yards, and material. A huge sum, but expended during times of war and under great duress, justified only as a war expenditure. But when one contemplates that figure and then reads from the last statement of the Shipping Board, issued in September, that the inventory value of the ships at that time was only \$226,733,315, the terrific loss of two and three quarter billions is, to say the least, impressive. A few ships have been sold, one sale the past summer netting about \$1,000,000, and other previous sales, the total of all, however, being inconsequential in comparison with the figures just given. In addition to the ships, the Government likewise owns various supplies and material, land and equipment, mortgages and securities, of more or less doubtful value, amounting to several millions additional. I have drawn attention to the fact that in addition to this great and natural shrinkage in value, as compared with war costs, the actual operating deficit is approximately \$50,000,000 per year. I believe the actual figures of the last two years, which, as I understand it, are the first from which

correct figures could be secured, amounted to about \$42,000,000, not including, however, depreciation, interest, or insurance on the investment.

We have already charged off over two and three-quarters billion as a war expense, and the fleet now has a value in round figures of \$225,000,000. Four per cent on this investment is \$9,000,000 per annum, to which should be added depreciation at the rate of 5 per cent. As the life of ships average about 20 years, this would amount to a further charge of \$11,250,000 per annum. So that to the operating deficit of forty-two million should be added for interest and depreciation a further \$20,250,000, making a total of over \$60,000,000 per year, which is the subsidy the American people are paying to maintain a Government-operated merchant marine. I have written off entirely the interest on the cost, which would be well over one hundred million.

On top of this, I see by the Budget recently presented to Congress that but thirty million is allowed for the ensuing year for the merchant marine. If operating expenses during the last year have shown a deficit of over forty million, not counting interest or depreciation, how would it be possible for the Shipping Board with a thirty million appropriation to take any action but to withdraw more ships from the sea in order to cut down their losses and keep within this appropriation as limited by law? And not one dollar for new ships. The proposition, if we face it for a moment, is so astounding, so absolutely impossible from a business standpoint, that it not only deserves but demands the attention of the Congress.

Speaking of the withdrawal of ships, it may be interesting for the Senate to know, if the Members are not already familiar with the facts, just how many ships are in operation now. According to the figures made public by the Shipping Board a couple of months ago, which are the last available, the board at that time owned 1,334 ships. Of this total 416 were in operation, or, as the board puts it, ready for spot delivery, while more than double that number, 882 to be exact, were laid up, exclusive of 36 tugs laid up or in operation. I am informed that since the issuance of that report some two or three months ago the number of ships in actual operation is still further decreased.

I am not criticizing the fact that so many ships are out of service. I naturally assume they are out of service because there is no demand for their tonnage and because their operation would add terrifically to the deficit. I have been told that the majority of the laid-up vessels were constructed to meet a war emergency and have little if any value as operating units. This explains in part the shrinkage of two and three-quarters billion dollars in the value of our fleet to-day as compared with its war cost.

Now for some remedies. I have introduced a bill in the Senate providing for the abolishment of the Shipping Board, now composed of seven members drawing each \$12,000 a year, together with a secretary at \$5,000, with the power to employ and fix the compensation of various other attachés.

In introducing this bill I want it to be clearly understood that it is in no wise a reflection on any of the individual members of the board, but is aimed entirely and alone at the system. I have had some experience in business administration and I can see nothing but confusion when a purely executive function has seven heads with equal responsibility. It is contrary to the policy in vogue in any successful business enterprise in the Nation. It is contrary to the policy in vogue in the Federal Government itself.

The Navy is managed by a single head; the Army likewise; the post-office business as well; the Budget and practically every other responsibility of an executive character. Boards are most helpful in passing upon many questions of policy or in a judicial capacity, but as boards are convened in the Army and Navy for various purposes, so could they be convened when necessary in the shipping administration. If there ever was a responsibility which required, in my judgment, one strong, powerful, executive head, it is in the administration of the American merchant marine.

I am convinced that the first step toward carrying out the direction of the shipping act of 1920, to dispose of the fleet and equipment, is the charging of the responsibility, without undue interference, to one properly qualified executive.

I recognize that the problems coming before the Shipping Board differ somewhat from other Government responsibilities, inasmuch as there are private interests in the shipping business with which, to a great extent, the Government necessarily competes. In view of this there may be justification for the retention of a board for the purpose of passing upon matters of this kind, but it should be absolutely removed from any responsibility of administration. As it is now operating, the

board sits in both a judicial and administrative capacity. Surely that is indefensible. If it is to be continued, it must in all fairness bear the same relation to privately owned and operated shipping as it does to the Government fleet.

I do not see how this much-to-be-desired remodeling of responsibilities can be assured without new legislation.

The act of 1920, under which the Shipping Board is now operating, certainly gives unlimited power to the board, and even though by resolution they abdicated that power confusion and conflict with an executive head would be sure to result.

Certainly past experience in every way justifies that conclusion. On September 30, 1921, the Shipping Board passed a comprehensive resolution delegating to the Emergency Fleet Corporation full power of administration, but from time to time have withdrawn the power so delegated until now administration is practically back in the hands of the seven commissioner executives.

I understand another effort is to be made to again pass such a resolution, and when the new president of the Fleet Corporation is appointed to give him the same power formerly lodged in this office.

That is all right as far as it goes, but experience has demonstrated it does not go far enough. In fact, according to information appearing in the press in the last 24 hours, the Shipping Board are balking on the suggestion to transfer their powers. Therefore, if that information is correct, the necessity for definite legislation is all the more apparent or the present costly system, with its dual responsibility and confusion, must continue. Surely it is too expensive to longer condone such a situation.

Even should they pass such a resolution as they did in 1921, it is human nature that with unlimited powers under existing legislation they would from time to time run counter to the executive, and, as has been the history of the past, create divisions and dissensions, with, of course, a lack of teamwork and desired results.

As is generally known, our shipping problems have been handled to a great extent through an intertwining if not a dual organization. The Emergency Fleet Corporation, which is a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia and which was considered necessary in order to administer such a responsibility, was a part of the act of 1916 and was deemed wise as a stimulant to shipping. We then entered the war. The 1920 act transferred the powers of the Emergency Fleet Corporation to the Shipping Board, where, as stated, they now remain. Therefore, no real power exists at the present time in the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the organization is, as explained, only continued through the authority delegated to it by the Shipping Board.

I am entirely in sympathy, as I have repeated, with the movement to delegate the administrative power to the president of this organization, but I contend that unless we pass legislation clearly defining the separate powers of the executive and Shipping Board, the latter confined to judicial and review, that we are doing nothing of a constructive character to place the responsibility for the operation of the fleet with the executive, and how can we expect better results?

This, however, is only one phase of this important question upon which, in my opinion, additional legislation is required. There is still another to which I wish also to refer.

During the last recess of Congress the Shipping Board had under consideration various plans to encourage outside interest in the merchant marine and Senators may or may not be familiar with some of the suggestions made. In my judgment, in carrying out certain of these suggestions lies the only remedy or opportunity to improve present conditions and reduce to a minimum the yearly operating deficit. Suggestion was made that subsidiary corporations be formed taking over different trade routes; inviting outside capital to purchase a minority interest, the Government retaining majority control; inviting men interested and familiar with shipping to become members of the individual boards to assist in the management. According to my understanding, this proposal in effect was adopted by a majority of the Shipping Board, but it was later determined by the Attorney General that the Shipping Board did not have the authority under existing legislation to carry out the plan.

I believe, Mr. President, that this general suggestion offers the only practical solution in sight and is the only method that can be adopted to stimulate interest in the merchant marine and to ultimately dispose of it as directed by the shipping act. If further legislation is necessary in order to bring about this much-to-be-desired stimulation, then there should be no delay in supplying the necessary laws. That is a legal question which I can not attempt to discuss.

The plan as I understand it would be first the organization of separate corporations to take over at a reasonable value, that is, one that would attract capital, the Government vessels, and so forth, now being operated in these various trade routes, the capital stock of each of these corporations to be an amount equal to the value of the vessels and to be held in the first instance by the Government. After these corporations have been organized the plan would be to offer for sale, at par, up to 48 per cent of the stock to those who were in any way interested in the particular trade, that is, operators, importers, exporters, as well as American shipowners who might be operating vessels of their own in such trade, and which business they might be willing to merge into such corporation, taking stock in the corporation in payment therefor. The majority of the board of directors of each company to be Government nominees or appointees, the minority shareholders to elect the remaining members of the board. The best shipping and business brains in the country would then be invited by the Government to become interested in these various corporations and in this way brought into the service of the Government. Through this method of administration, as soon as the service was put on a profitable basis and a good will, which is all important, in the shipping business established, then the balance of the Government's stock in the corporation could be properly sold to the private interests who had already developed it or to the highest bidder.

That is what the 1920 act directs. Then why should there be any opposition to providing the necessary vehicle and system? Most assuredly no sales would be made excepting under contract with the Government to maintain a satisfactory service and, of course, with a complete agreement that the ships should always be under American registry.

In view of the uncertainty raised by the opinion of the Attorney General, it seems essential that Congress should make a definite statement by law that the United States will operate these routes through the subsidiary corporations or that they will be operated by private American interests, but that under one form or the other permanency will be assured. The lack of such permanency to-day in my judgment has much to do with the difficulties encountered by the Shipping Board in tying up shippers to the exclusive use of the American fleet. Of course, a proper understanding must be had with such corporations in order that they may not have any special immunity from the Government but may compete precisely on the same basis, so far as governmental aid is concerned, as do any private organizations controlled by American capital. Certainly no one can deny that so long as we are enlisted in the cause of the American merchant marine it is not fair to the American shipowner and the private operator for his Government to go in competition with him and through a liberal use of the taxpayer's money make up the deficits of Government-operated ships where American taxpayers administering a private line have no wealthy godfather to whom to appeal.

We have reached the time for decision. We must either decide on a Government owned and administered merchant marine, to which policy I am unalterably opposed, and which necessarily means the continued expenditure of a large sum of money, or do that which is necessary to make salable the vessels now in operation.

Even permanent Government ownership advocates should not object to this plan, as all must agree that improved service and value, developed while still under Government control, could not be successfully assailed by either class of advocates.

If there is no action in the present Congress in either of these directions, then, in my judgment, the drift must plainly be to a permanently owned and administered merchant marine, ineffective and unnecessarily expensive. Rather than this, I believe the Shipping Board, with the proper qualifications of American ownership and American registry, should without delay sell the fleet and the equipment, if necessary, on the auction block to the highest bidder.

No one would regret such action more than myself, but I am convinced the time has arrived when at least new and forceful methods of a recognized business character must be adopted in order that the taxpayers may be at least partially relieved of this burden. With interest, depreciation, and replacements considered, in addition to losses by operation, we must in the future be prepared to meet an annual outgo of many millions of dollars.

The very least we can do at this time is to have a committee survey the present situation, the necessity for replacements, and the possibility of further interesting the public. To permit the management of this great and expensive undertaking to go along even with the control delegated as suggested would simply be putting off the evil day and adding to our

burden when we were finally brought face to face with the inevitable.

No one underrates the value of a merchant marine, but at least let us try to adopt businesslike methods in an effort to minimize its losses and perpetuate its existence.

During the delivery of Mr. Edge's speech,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LENROOT in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the election of a chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

After the conclusion of Mr. Edge's speech,

PROPOSED BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 76.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. Let the bill be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It occurs to the Chair that a vote upon the unfinished business would not be in order until 2.30 o'clock. If this motion should prevail, it would displace the unfinished business.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that this bill was being considered in the morning hour and that at 2 o'clock unanimous consent was given that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. That would naturally keep this measure before the Senate. Therefore I think the measure will be before the Senate until it shall have been displaced by taking up the unfinished business, which can be done by motion only.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, when the hour of 2 o'clock arrived, no agreement having been made at that time—

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it has been the uniform ruling of the Chair that when at 2 o'clock a measure has been pending and by unanimous consent the unfinished business has been set aside temporarily the measure under consideration at that time continues before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Exactly; but there was nothing pending at the time the unfinished business was set aside.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; this bill has been pending all morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But not after the hour of 2 o'clock.

Mr. CURTIS. It was pending at 2 o'clock, and at that time unanimous consent was asked and granted to set aside the unfinished business, and that kept this measure before the Senate. That is the way every such measure has been kept before the Senate since I have been in the Senate. If that course should not be pursued, Senators would be compelled to move the consideration of the measure pending at 2 o'clock, which would displace the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Kansas is correct in the statement that the request was made at 2 o'clock, then the Chair misunderstood the situation.

Mr. CURTIS. The request was made at 2 o'clock.

Mr. ROBINSON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ROBINSON. I was out of the Chamber in the anteroom when the hour of 2 o'clock arrived, and I inquire whether at the hour of 2 o'clock the Chair laid before the Senate the unfinished business and whether it was formally laid aside?

Mr. CURTIS. It was.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well. Then I do not see that there is any difficulty about the matter.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I made the request immediately upon the unfinished business being laid before the Senate.

PROPOSED PRINTING IN THE RECORD.

Mr. SPENCER. If there is no objection, I ask to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. MacDonald, including quotations from speeches of the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the article sent by him to the desk be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I shall not object, but I call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] announced that he should object to the printing of that article in the RECORD, and I was wondering whether the Senator from Missouri wanted

to take advantage of the temporary absence of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SPENCER. The Senator from New Hampshire asked me this morning in a spirit of pleasantry whether the article had as yet been printed in the *Record*, and I assumed from that he did not care particularly, or I should not have made the request.

Mr. WILLIS. I simply wished to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire and to ask if he wished to take the responsibility. He may take it if he so desires, and I shall not object to his request.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, before unanimous consent is given to print in the *Record* the article entitled "The Scientific Political Training of President Coolidge," I have a remark to make.

When first I came to the Senate I sinned frequently by attempting to include into the *Record* from time to time a large number of speeches, declamations, orations, compositions, and articles written by publicity seekers, but within the past seven or eight years I have reformed. I have come to the conclusion that it is not good policy to make the *Congressional Record* a propaganda sheet. I am not going to object to the request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], but just as surely as this article goes into the *Record* there will come from my State a flood of letters, accompanied by articles which I will be asked to have printed, eulogizing Hon. William G. McAdoo, whom I am proudly and gladly supporting for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency—and I support him because of his vast experience, his courage, and his exalted character—and some of the writers of such letters will ask me why I have not the perspicacity and the industry to get their articles printed in the *Record* to offset the propaganda flowing from the articles offered to-day by my friend from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER].

The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has many supporters in my State and they may write me and ask me why do I not have printed in the *Record* articles which they have written urging the nomination of that courageous and capable statesman, Senator JAMES A. REED; and the friends of other candidates will likewise write me.

The able and diligent Senator from Missouri, of course, is aware that the Republican National Committee, or such minority of the Republican National Committee as is in favor of Mr. Coolidge's renomination, will want to reprint this article and send it out at public expense to millions of voters.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. Why could they not just as well take one from Judge? It would be just as likely to be accurate.

Mr. ASHURST. The article on President Coolidge would be funnier.

Mr. CARAWAY. And more nearly accurate.

Mr. ASHURST. And more nearly accurate. Now, speaking in the attitude of a self-reformed sinner, I feel I have the right to indulge that freedom of speech which ordinarily is the prerogative of reformed persons. I believe that the Senate should draw a line at this time and not include in the *Record* hereafter articles of this nature. However, I shall not object in this instance, because I am going to ask in conjunction with the request of the Senator from Missouri that my remarks on this subject may be included in the same kind of type at the head of the article as a part and parcel of the article, so that if the article be circulated the antidote may go out to the country with the poison.

Mr. ROBINSON and Mr. WILLIS addressed the Chair.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. In view of the discussion which has occurred, I was just about to make an objection to the insertion of the article in the *Record*. I object.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I only entered the Chamber as this—I was about to say altercation—this colloquy drew to a close. Do I understand I will be estopped from offering for inclusion in the *Record* the remarks of notorious pro-leguans on the subject of the Bok plan?

Mr. ROBINSON. Nothing, Mr. President, can preclude the Senator from Illinois from exercising his prerogative to ask that there be inserted in the *Record* any matter which he desires to have inserted.

Mr. McCORMICK. I understand that.

Mr. ROBINSON. But the Senators, I take it, will exercise their right and their privilege to object, if they see fit to do so.

Mr. ASHURST. Moreover, Mr. President, it would be unnecessary for the Senator from Illinois to include in the

Record anybody's article respecting the Bok plan, because the able Senator is so thoroughly disgusted with the Bok plan and with that kind of propaganda that his own remarks would be sufficiently weighty, and it would not be necessary for him to go out and find remarks of anyone else to include in the *Record* to bolster up his argument. Very little will be placed in the *Record* against the Bok plan, because it will fall of its own inherent weakness.

Mr. McCORMICK. Oh, Saul is among the prophets to-day.

Mr. President, if I may crave the indulgence of those who would—

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a moment? I merely wish to ask a question.

Mr. McCORMICK. I yield for a moment, although it will not take me more than a moment to introduce these adulatory encomiums on the Bok plan.

Mr. SPENCER. The Senator from Illinois having yielded to me a moment, I desire to say that I understood the Senator from Arkansas objected to the printing of the article in the *Record*. Am I correct in my understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He did.

Mr. SPENCER. I merely wish to say that the Subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections meets at this time, or I should give myself the privilege of reading that article in the Senate, which, of course, the Senator from Arkansas knew I would do when he objected. I shall read the article at the first convenient opportunity.

PROPOSED BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to state, recurring to the status of the bill of the Senator from Washington, that, in the opinion of the present occupant of the chair, the bill referred to did not continue before the Senate upon the laying aside of the unfinished business. It is the opinion of the Chair that when the hour of 2 o'clock arrived the bill then before the Senate automatically went back to the calendar, and that it would require a request upon the part of the Senator from Washington to again bring the bill before the Senate after 2 o'clock. That could be done, the unfinished business being temporarily laid aside.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois who has the floor will yield to me for a moment—

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

Mr. CURTIS. In order that we may have something before the Senate I suggest—

Mr. McCORMICK. I was going to get the Bok plan before the Senate if I could.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is nothing before the Senate.

Mr. McCORMICK. There is not much in the Bok plan; so that, if the Bok plan is before the Senate, there is nothing serious before it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Washington for a request.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Illinois has the floor and I did not care to interrupt him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Technically there is nothing before the Senate to which any Senator may address himself.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill No. 76.

Mr. CURTIS. I suggest that the Senator from Washington ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Very well; I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill No. 76.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will that displace the matter of the election of a chairman for the Committee on Interstate Commerce?

Mr. JONES of Washington. If unanimous consent is given, and the bill should come up in that way, it would not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it proposed to vote on the chairmanship to-day or not?

Mr. JONES of Washington. If anybody desires the bill to go over until to-morrow I shall not ask to dispose of it to-day, because it is a measure of considerable importance. I hope to proceed with its consideration as far as we can; and if any Senator desires it to go over until to-morrow, and not have it disposed of to-day, I shall not insist upon its disposition to-day.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not examined it, but I should like to have it go over.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is a bill that the Senate passed at the last Congress, after discussing it for several days.

If the Senator desires it to go over I shall not insist upon its being disposed of to-day, but I should like to take it up and proceed as far as possible with it. There are several amendments that I have no doubt we can dispose of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 76) to create a bureau of aeronautics in the Department of Commerce, to encourage and regulate the operation of civil aircraft in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

THE BOK PEACE JURY.

Mr. McCORMICK. The bill of the Senator from Washington, at all events, is less ephemeral and diaphanous than the Bok plan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer for the RECORD the statements of the most phrenetic, if not the most conspicuous, advocates of the league in this country—Mr. Justice Clarke, Mr. Wickersham, and Mr. Hamilton Holt—in endorsing the Bok plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

INDORSE BOK PLAN AS STEP TO LEAGUE—NONPARTISAN ASSOCIATION SAYS IT LEADS IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION AND MERITS SUPPORT—EX-JUSTICE CLARKE'S VIEW—PROPOSAL IS PRAISED BY HAMILTON HOLT AND OTHERS—NO MORE WAR—PEACE UNION OPPOSED.

[From the New York Times of January 8, 1924.]

General approval of the winning Bok prize peace plan was expressed yesterday by the League of Nations Nonpartisan Association.

A statement of the association, made public by former Justice John H. Clarke, its president, and George W. Wickersham, president of its council, declared that, while the plan was not acceptable as a substitute for the program of the association, which looks to the entrance of the United States into the league, it opened the door for entrance and accordingly merited the support of friends of the league.

Justice Clarke in an individual statement went slightly further than the statement of the association and expressed dissent from the conditions proposed by the plan for the full cooperation of the United States with the league. Mr. Clarke said he believed the proposal to eliminate force or an economic boycott as a last resort to enforce the provisions of Articles X and XVI of the league covenant was going too far in the present state of civilization for a working plan. He added that he had no objection to an attempt to bring about such a change.

Justice Clarke declared, however, that, although he would have favored the entrance of the United States into the league "with our heads up and flags flying," the plan was so well adapted to conciliating differences of opinion that he believed the friends of peace should approve and vote for it.

INDORSEMENT BY ASSOCIATION.

The statement of the League of Nations Nonpartisan Association, which was framed after a conference of Justice Clarke, Mr. Wickersham, and other members of the executive committee and council, follows:

"The League of Nations Nonpartisan Association welcomes both of the suggestions contained in the Bok prize peace plan. This association's program has from the beginning included insistence upon the desirability of the United States giving its support to the Permanent Court of International Justice. The proposed extension of American cooperation with the League of Nations would constitute a clear advance toward the achievement of the desire of this association that the United States become a member of the League of Nations on terms 'consistent with our national Constitution and consonant with the dignity and honor, moral responsibility, and power of our Republic.'

"While the plan is not acceptable as a substitute for the program of this association, it does offer a door through which America may enter the League of Nations, and therefore all friends of the league can well support it."

In his personal comment on the plan, Justice Clarke said:

"It is an impressive fact that a committee of distinguished men and women from both political parties should select from 22,165 plans offered one which adopts the covenant of the League of Nations, with only 2 of its 26 articles considerably modified, as the best practicable plan for cooperation of our country with other nations 'to achieve and preserve the peace of the world.' Assuredly this is a great tribute to the wisdom of the covenant and an unexpected justification of those of us who have been advocating its acceptance by our country, with reservations.

SEES ULTIMATE COOPERATION.

"As a basis of his proposals the author of the winning plan assumes these facts to be established: (1) That the existing League of Nations is a world organization to promote international cooperation so firmly established that the 54 nations members of it 'can not and will not abandon' it; (2) that the few nations outside the league (54 are in and 8 outside) are of such character that the United States 'can not hopefully cooperate' with them; and (3) that the 'sheer force of international gravitation' will render cooperation with the league by our Government ultimately inevitable. It is difficult to see how any candid mind can question the validity of these conclusions.

"Coming now to the proposals.

"The first is that the United States shall immediately adhere to the World Court, for the reasons and under the conditions stated by Secretary Hughes and President Harding in February, 1923. Our association promptly approved this proposal when it was made.

"It is next proposed that our Government shall extend its present cooperation with various humanitarian agencies of the league so as to include them all, but without joining the league.

"This," says the author, "is as far as we can go in cooperation for world peace without assuming direct relations with the assembly and council of the league," and he goes forward with his plan for membership, which consists of five proposals, as follows:

"The first proposal is for a reservation with respect to the Monroe doctrine, which we think probably does not enlarge the construction which the agencies of the league would place in practice on the reservation of the doctrine contained in the covenant. Objection to its scope will probably come from the nations to the south of us, but friends of the league should accept it and trust to a calmer and wiser day to modify its terms.

"The second proposal is that the United States shall not assume any obligations under Articles X and XVI except as Congress shall in each case authorize, and shall also propose that these two articles be dropped or modified to eliminate any suggestion of resort to either force or the economic boycott as a means of enforcing the obligations of members.

SHOULD VOTE FOR PLAN, HE SAYS.

"In my judgment, in the present state of what is called civilization, this is going too far for a working plan, and I think it would be wiser to retain both of these sanctions to be resorted to as the covenant provides only after all the peaceful defenses against war have failed and, preferably, giving effect to them through treaties of mutual assistance supplementing the covenant.

"But we see no objection to attempting to secure such a change or to trying it if it can be obtained. If it is obtained and fails, the mistake can be corrected, or we can retire to our isolation again. While this proposal seems to us unwise, it is not sufficiently so to justify rejection of the plan.

"The third proposal is that we shall not assume any obligations under the existing peace treaties. As we are not claiming any advantages under these treaties except as they are embodied in our treaty with Germany, this may be accepted, but not without a blush.

"The fourth proposal is that article 1 shall be modified so as to admit any self-governing state to the league upon its receiving the favorable vote of two-thirds of the assembly. This is not a great change, and, since the success of the league depends on its ultimately including all of the nations, it may well be approved.

"The final proposal is that provision be made for the revision and development of international law. To this there can be no objection.

"While I should much prefer a more immediate and direct entrance to the league than this plan proposes—an entrance with our heads up and flags flying—nevertheless, the plan is so well adapted to conciliating differences of opinion which must be recognized as existing in our country that, having regard to the importance on the part of the friends of peace of sinking all possible differences in the hope of uniting the nations in time to avert another world war, I think we should approve it and vote for it."

HAMILTON HOLT PRAISES PLAN.

Hamilton Holt, chairman of the finance committee of the League of Nations Nonpartisan Association, characterized the winning plan as an admirably worked out compromise.

"It is a public service of which the author may be proud," he said. "Friends of the League of Nations in America have since the last presidential campaign refrained from trying to formulate an exact plan by which the United States might enter the league. Any concrete formula would necessarily either go too far or not far enough when it came to run the gantlet of the United States Senate and the assembly of the league.

"Friends of the league till now have for the most part contented themselves with preaching the notable record of things accomplished by the league in the four years of its existence, urging the United States to enter on any terms agreeable to two-thirds of the Senate,

provided only they were in conformity with the Constitution and consonant with the honor and dignity and moral responsibility of the Republic.

"The Bok plan is, therefore, the first attempt to reverse this policy. It has the good fortune of being put out under sufficiently happy auspices to get for it a nation-wide hearing. Whether it is the best plan that is practicable, of course no one can say. Certainly the wisest thing for the United States to do would be to join the league as it is and then work from within for any changes in the covenant that seemed desirable. But doubtless this is too sensible to be realized.

"If, therefore, the present plan turns out to be the best we can get, surely all friends of the league, both Democrats and Republicans, can unite on it as a measurable and honorable step forward in the fight to complete the work our boys began in France. For whatever the future has in store, it is certain that the agitation for American entrance into the league will not cease until that result is accomplished, and we have kept faith with the dead."

"I should prefer the United States to become a member of the league as at present constituted, with proper reservation," said Manley O. Hudson, professor of international law at the Harvard Law School. "The plan stops short of that, but does not preclude it in the future.

"It is not quite clear to me how the United States will participate in the work of the assembly and council without some sort of associated membership. The plan is not definite as to whether the conditions and reservations must be made before or after the American participation begins, nor does it distinguish sharply between conditions precedent to cooperation and proposals to be made after cooperation has been begun."

Mr. McCORMICK. Likewise, I ask unanimous consent to offer for the RECORD two cable dispatches from a very great newspaper, of which the editor is a frenzied and frantic supporter of the league, entitled, respectively, "Europe again sees America in league," and "A big peace step, say league chiefs. Bok award creates immense satisfaction at Geneva headquarters."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 8, 1924.]

EUROPE AGAIN SEES AMERICA IN LEAGUE—APPROVAL OF BOK PLAN IN REFERENDUM WOULD BE TAKEN AS A HARBINGER—GREAT INTEREST IN PARIS—NO OBJECTION WOULD BE MADE TO SUGGESTED RESERVATIONS, EVEN IF CONSIDERED ILLOGICAL.

(By Edwin L. James. Special cable to the New York Times.)

(Copyright, 1924, by the New York Times Co.)

PARIS, January 7.—The terms of the peace plan which has won the \$50,000 Bok award are causing interest in Paris, because the proposals for American participation in international affairs all hinge on the recognition of existing institutions rather than tending to suggestions for the formation of new courts and new leagues, which suggestions European statesmen have consistently regarded as chimerical if not hypocritical.

Not only do Frenchmen get some hope from the fact that of the 22,165 plans submitted the judges chose as best that which would put America into the World Court and shove her toward the League of Nations, but it is understood in league circles here that a vast majority of the more than 20,000 plans recommended various degrees of joining the league.

The referendum on the Bok plan will be watched with much interest on this side of the Atlantic, and it is believed that it will offer a better indication of the American attitude on the league than did the 1920 elections.

The Bok plan for joining the World Court is regarded here as identical with the suggestion of the late President Harding. The second set of proposals relating to the league arouse even greater interest, and at luncheon to-day a well-known figure in the League of Nations expressed to me the opinion that American approval of the proposals would amount to approval of eventually joining the league with reservations. Now league leaders have always been only too glad to listen to American proposals for reservations. Europe never agreed with Mr. Wilson that Europe would not accept American reservations and no American reservations to the covenant have ever been suggested seriously which the league would not have considered most seriously.

AMERICA OFTEN INVITED.

One suggestion that without now joining the league America participate in its works will arouse no opposition in Europe, for the league has consistently invited Washington to send delegates to any and all of its various conferences. Sometimes Washington has and sometimes Washington has not, apparently following no well-defined rule—but Washington has always been welcome.

As for the Monroe doctrine, it is pointed out here that it is already cared for in the covenant, which recognized it. America could never persuade Europe entirely of the complete efficacy of moral suasion on which the Bok plan lays emphasis, but European statesmen would be perfectly willing to have America a member of the league on the condition that she be not bound to take any action that Congress did not approve. That moral suasion will not fit any case is an argument in support of which Europe would cite Germany.

That under the plan America—not a member of the league—would make recommendations as to who should join it does not appear very logical to European critics except on the presumption that subconsciously the author was looking further ahead than his plan says—namely, to American membership.

All in all, if America adopts the Bok plan, there could not be the slightest doubt that it would serve as the basis of negotiations to open the door of the league to America, or rather, to put on the league whatever door America would chose to go through.

A BIG PEACE STEP, SAY LEAGUE CHIEFS—BOK AWARD CREATES IMMENSE SATISFACTION AT GENEVA HEADQUARTERS.

GENEVA, January 7 (Associated Press).—The proposals contained in the Bok peace award created immense satisfaction in League of Nations circles here to-night. Basing their views upon a somewhat meager summary of the project telephoned from Paris, league officials said the plan as outlined constituted a tremendous contribution to world peace and cooperation.

In the absence of the full text of the plan, officials were wary in committing the league in any way, but they seemed to have received the impression that adoption of the American plan would be tantamount to the United States becoming an associate member of the League of Nations.

Representative members of the secretariat said they would be glad to see the Bok proposals adopted by the United States Government and presented to other nations for consideration as the best means for opening negotiations for further American participation in the league's activities. Undoubtedly, they added, some things involved serious modifications of the league organization. For instance, much depended on how far the United States would insist on going in connection with Articles X and XVI of the covenant. If the United States insisted that no nations were to be bound by these, it might be difficult to arrange the articles in question to suit the American Government.

Broadly speaking, league ratification was based on the belief that adoption of the scheme, with ratification by the other nations, would break the deadlock which has existed during the last five years among those who are struggling for international cooperation and good will. The Bok project, it is asserted, offers a basis for helpful consultation to heal the differences among those striving for world cooperation and world harmony.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, the League of Nations, of course, already had been well advertised by long months of debate in the Senate at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States and of the time of Senators. Mr. Bok himself has been well advertised, at his own expense so far as we know, and presently will be further advertised at the expense of his fellow publishers. I have risen to-day, not to consider the Bok scheme in detail, but to point out first that those who have acclaimed its publication to the world are those who have been the most unqualified and immoderate advocates of American adhesion to the covenant of the League of Nations. I have risen, too, to call to the attention of the Senate the circumstances under which the Bok scheme was awarded the prize by a packed jury; for those who passed upon the many plans submitted were without exception, or almost without exception, advocates of American adherence to the League of Nations, presided over by one of the greatest lawyers in this country, who in the days of ancient Athens might well have been charged with being able to make the lesser appear the greater reason.

If I remember rightly, he first became conspicuous at the bar as the defender of the notorious Tweed, and when last he appeared at the bar of the United States it was for the purpose of undoing that which had been done by the Congress and the legislatures of the United States in proposing and ratifying the eighteenth amendment.

As part of the program, the gentlemen who have argued the case for the Bok plan, prior even to its publication, have enlisted in its support some who, under the rules of the award, can not have studied its terms. The president of the Federation of Women's Clubs, as I have subsequently been informed, at Mr. Bok's instance, and before the publication of the plan which was awarded the prize, stated in a circular letter to the women's clubs of Illinois that Senator MEDILL McCORMICK and Senator WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY are reported to be among the

small group who are likely to play politics with this question. Let it be said for Mrs. Winter that when the text of her letter was called to her attention she telegraphed all the women's clubs to which she had addressed the letter and retracted the statement made at Mr. Bok's instance; and I offer for the RECORD the text of that telegram.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the matter referred to by him. Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

(Western Union Telegram.)

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., January 4, 1924.

I realize that I have made a grave mistake sending a letter criticizing motives of any United States Senator. Tried myself too late to hold the letter back. I greatly regret the action and will follow it closely by another letter acknowledging my error.

MRS. THOMAS G. WINTER.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and the Senate itself, in due course and with orderly dispatch, will consider the plan submitted to the Senate by the Executive and any reservations or amendments thereto which may be proposed. Surely Senators, all of them, will resent the imputation that we here who have lived through the trying times of the reconstruction will not seek to discharge our full duty in the consideration of the protocol before the Foreign Relations Committee. We are charged with certain responsibilities under the Constitution. If we were to be derelict in their discharge because of a propaganda organized in behalf of Mr. Bok's scheme or any other, we ought rightly to forfeit the confidence of our constituents, and each of us so derelict to forfeit the confidence of our fellows.

The task set before us is no easy one. The diminution of the probability of war, the arbitrament of disputes between peoples, have tried statesmen through long generations. In Europe, the seat of the league itself, wars in fact, if not in law, have been fought in defiance of the league. Powers, little and great, repeatedly have repudiated and defied the league. It is manifest, I think, alike to those who believe that we should have adhered to the covenant no less than to those who held the contrary view, that no written instrument, no formal agreement among the nations, by itself or through the adhesion thereto of a majority of the powers, will banish war or change the inherited characteristics of mankind.

If we are to accomplish anything in this matter at this session, Mr. President, we must bear and forbear. We must move with prudence and with patience, insisting that no organized pressure shall be brought to bear upon Senators to yield their judgment to the passion of those less informed, or to thrust aside the duty which conscience lays upon them in a matter so grave as this.

PROPOSED BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that Senate bill No. 76 may be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 76) to create a bureau of aeronautics in the Department of Commerce, to encourage and regulate the operation of civil aircraft in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that the bill may be read for action on the amendments of the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington asks that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for action on the amendments of the committee. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the reading of the bill I would like to ask the chairman of the committee about two of its provisions. Subsection (c) of section 4, on page 3 of the bill, gives the Secretary of Commerce the right to investigate and recommend air routes, and subsection (i) of the same section on page 4 reads:

(i) To operate and for this purpose to purchase, when appropriations shall have been made to do so, such aircraft as the Secretary of Commerce may deem necessary for inspecting, licensing, regulating, and controlling the operation of civil aircraft, and for determining air routes, landing fields, and air stations, Government machines to be used if possible and the consent of the department having control of the same can be secured.

I want to ask the Senator from Washington, in the first place, if it is the purpose of the bill to give authority to the department to establish exclusive air routes to individuals or corporations?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Not at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not so sure but that language might give rise to such a power being claimed. It seems to me, if it is not the purpose to give exclusive rights now, in the beginning of the use of aircraft, as we are really just in the beginning of the use of it, we ought to make it perfectly apparent that the Government is going to control these interstate air routes, and I suggest an amendment of this sort to the Senator's consideration, that after the word "secured," in line 18, on page 4, we insert the following proviso:

Provided, That no exclusive rights to air routes shall be assigned to any corporation or individual, but all air routes shall be by license only, revocable at the pleasure of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. JONES of Washington. We are not licensing air routes. We only recommend routes to people who are engaged in civil aviation.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator can see what is going through my mind in regard to it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The first part of the Senator's amendment seems to be all right and I would have no objection to it, although I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is not the purpose to give to any person or corporation rights in certain routes, I think we ought to say so. I think we ought to guard the language very carefully. As I said, the use of aircraft is in its infancy; we do not know what its development may be in the future, and we should be very careful not to create vested rights in any particular corporation or individual in the future.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If the Senator will prepare an amendment covering his thought, I do not think there will be any objection to it. I now ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 5, before the word "aeronautics," to insert the word "civil," so as to make the paragraph read:

That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he is hereby, authorized to establish in the Department of Commerce a bureau to be known as the bureau of civil aeronautics.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 10, after the word "jurisdiction," to strike out the words "except in conformity with the provisions of this act and such rules and regulations as may be promulgated pursuant thereto," so as to make the paragraph read:

The term "commerce" when used in this act means the flying, navigating, or operating of any civil aircraft in interstate or foreign commerce, or in, over, or through the District of Columbia, the Territories, dependencies, reservations, national parks, or over any place or building over which the United States has jurisdiction.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendments were, in section 3, on page 2, line 14, before the word "aeronautics," to insert the word "civil," and on page 3, line 3, before the word "aeronautics," to insert the word "civil," so as to make the section read:

Sec. 3. That there shall be at the head of such bureau when established a commissioner of civil aeronautics, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary of \$6,000 per annum. There shall be also a chief clerk of said bureau who, in addition to the usual duties of a chief clerk, may act as commissioner, under the direction of the Secretary, and such other deputies, assistants, and employees as may be required from time to time, and for which appropriations shall have been made, and the Secretary of Commerce may, at any time, utilize the services of such officers or employees of any other bureau or division of the Department of Commerce as he may deem necessary in the administration of this act, or he may take from such bureaus or divisions such parts thereof as he may deem advisable to create the bureau of civil aeronautics or to consolidate such parts with that bureau.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. On page 2, line 6, there is a misspelling of the word "aircraft" after the word "civil." I suggest an amendment to correct that error.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 14, before the word "commerce," to strike out the words "interstate and foreign," so as to make the paragraph read:

(a) To inspect, in order to safeguard life and property, all aircraft before it is used in commerce and certify as to its condition, capacity, and safety at the date of inspection and to make the information contained in such certificate available to the public in such manner as he may prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 18, page 4, the last paragraph read being as follows:

(i) To operate and for this purpose to purchase, when appropriations shall have been made to do so, such aircraft as the Secretary of Commerce may deem necessary for inspecting, licensing, regulating, and controlling the operation of civil aircraft and for determining air routes, landing fields, and air stations, Government machines to be used if possible and the consent of the department having control of the same can be secured.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I ask consent of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, in charge of the bill, to consider at this point a very minor amendment, which might be inserted on line 17, and which I am quite sure would make the meaning of the concluding sentence of the paragraph a little plainer? It reads now:

Government machines to be used if possible and the consent of the department having control of the same can be secured.

That scarcely makes sense. I suggest that the word "if" be inserted after the word "and" on line 17 so that it would read:

Government machines to be used if possible and if the consent of the department having control of the same can be secured.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no objection to that amendment. I think it would be very proper.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I offer that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent to offer the following amendment to that paragraph after the word "secured" on line 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to offer an amendment, which, in the absence of objection, the Secretary will report.

The READING CLERK. On page 4, line 18, after the word "secured" and before the period, insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no exclusive rights or privileges to any air routes shall be assigned to any individual or corporation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no objection to that amendment. I do not really think it is necessary, but I have no objection to it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Should not the language read "any individual, association, or corporation"?

Mr. McKELLAR. I accept the suggestion to insert after the word "individual" the word "association."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendments of the committee were, on page 4, line 22, before the word "aeronautics," to insert the word "civil," and on line 23 to strike out the numeral "2" and insert the numeral "3," so as to make the paragraph read:

(j) To prepare and maintain a comprehensive survey and inventory of all industrial and civil aeronautical resources under the jurisdiction of the United States. The Secretary may direct the commissioner of civil aeronautics, or any other officer or employee referred to in section 3, to perform any or all of the aforesaid duties.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, on page 5, line 3, before the word "aeronautics," to insert the word "civil," so as to read:

SEC. 5. That for the purpose of making effective the provisions of this act the Secretary of Commerce shall direct the commissioner of civil aeronautics to provide regulations, which shall become effective upon the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, for the following, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, on page 6, line 16, to strike out "six months" and insert in lieu thereof the words "thirty days," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 7. That all rules and regulations authorized under the provisions of this act shall, by the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, be formulated by the commissioner of aeronautics after consultation with other established governmental agencies concerned, and upon the approval of such rules and regulations by the Secretary of Commerce they shall be promulgated by him and shall have the effect of law and be enforceable from the date of such promulgation unless otherwise provided therein. The Secretary of Commerce shall have the power to suspend or revoke such rules and regulations and to alter or amend the same and promulgate new rules and regulations, such alterations,

amendments, and new rules and regulations not to take effect until at least 30 days shall have elapsed and to take such steps as he may deem necessary to bring such changes to the notice of those affected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 20, before the word "aeronautics," to insert the word "civil," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 8. That, by the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, the commissioner of civil aeronautics shall, after consulting with other departments of the Government concerned, establish the conditions in order to safeguard life and property under which persons may be carried and property imported and exported in civil aircraft in commerce and to prescribe the areas within which aircraft entering the United States, its Territories and dependencies, or the waters thereof, are to alight and the conditions to be complied with by such aircraft, which shall become effective upon the approval of the Secretary of Commerce.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 6, to strike out the words "shall be deemed to be duly licensed operators and pilots under this act" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "may, upon compliance with the terms of this act, be duly licensed as operators and pilots without charge," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 9. That operators and pilots of aircraft duly licensed under State laws may, upon compliance with the terms of this act, be duly licensed as operators and pilots without charge.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 22, after the word "commerce," to insert the words "except in conformity with the provisions of this act and such rules and regulations as may be promulgated pursuant thereto," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 12. That it shall be unlawful to use any civil aircraft in commerce except in conformity with the provisions of this act and such rules and regulations as may be promulgated pursuant thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 25, after the words "and that the," to insert the words "Secretary of War, the," so as to read:

SEC. 16. That for the purpose of encouraging the development of civil aviation in the United States, full cooperation shall be given by the Secretary of Commerce to the owners or operators of civil aircraft, and that the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Commerce, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to the end of section 16, line 11, page 9.

Mr. JONES of Washington. On page 9, line 5, after the word "aviation," the printer has inserted the wrong line and omitted several words which must be inserted. I move to amend by striking out, in line 6, the words "may approve and promulgate for their respective services," and to insert in lieu thereof the words "fuel oil supplies and provide necessary mechanical services."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 9, line 6, strike out the words "may approve and promulgate for their respective services" and insert in lieu thereof "fuel oil supplies and provide necessary mechanical services," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 16. That for the purpose of encouraging the development of civil aviation in the United States full cooperation shall be given by the Secretary of Commerce to the owners or operators of civil aircraft, and that the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Commerce may, in cases of emergency, sell to any owner or operator of civil aircraft landing on an air station or landing field under their respective jurisdictions aviation fuel-oil supplies and provide necessary mechanical services of an emergency character, under such regulations as they may approve and promulgate for their respective services. The proceeds from such sales and services shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriations involved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 17, before the word "aeronautics," to insert the word "civil," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 18. That the commissioner of civil aeronautics shall annually, at the close of each fiscal year, make a report to the Secretary of Commerce, giving an account of all monies received and disbursed by

him and describing the work done by the bureau, and the Secretary of Commerce shall transmit such report to Congress with the annual report of the Department of Commerce.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, to strike out lines 24 and 25, and on page 10 to strike out lines 1, 2, and 3, being section 19, in the following words:

SEC. 19. That the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over all claims and controversies involving aircraft, their owners, lessees, charterers, and operators licensed thereunder, with the right of appeal as in other cases.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendments were to renumber sections 19, 20, 21, and 22, on page 10.

The amendments were agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I note that section 19, conferring jurisdiction on the district courts of the United States in certain cases growing out of the measure, has been stricken out. May I inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill how and in what jurisdiction it is proposed to enforce the provisions of the law?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It will leave them to the remedies that come naturally in the local courts for disagreements or collisions or anything of that sort. Or, if the residences of the different parties permit, they may go to the Federal courts; in other words, we leave them as ordinarily to a remedy.

Mr. ROBINSON. The provision as originally written would have given exclusive jurisdiction to the United States courts.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; and really as written in the bill as originally introduced it was quite different from that. Our committee reported the other provision in the last Congress and then on the floor it was stricken out and the parties were left to the ordinary remedies. I think that is better.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think that is an improvement.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I desire to offer an amendment on page 5, line 20. The language now reads:

Provided, That in the case of a corporation or association no such aircraft shall be owned by such corporation or association unless the president and board of directors, etc.

I think we should strike out the words "be owned" and insert the words "be used in commerce," as that was the intention of the paragraph.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think there is no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York offers an amendment, which will be reported.

The READING CLERK. On page 5, line 20, strike out the words "be owned" and insert in lieu thereof the words "be used in commerce," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That in the case of a corporation or association no such aircraft shall be used in commerce by such corporation or association unless the president and board of directors or the managing officers thereof, as the case may be, are citizens of the United States, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Again, on page 7, in section 10, it will be noted that the phrase "our pilots" is used in line 13 and again in line 14. It strikes me that the phrase "our pilots" has a somewhat conversational tone to it for use at least in a statute of the United States. We might better use the expression "licensed pilots of the United States." I move to strike out the word "our," in line 13, on page 7, and insert the word "licensed," and after the word "pilots," in the same line, insert the words "of the United States."

Mr. JONES of Washington. There is no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 7, line 13, before the word "pilots," strike out the word "our" and insert in lieu thereof the word "licensed," and after the word "pilots" insert the words "of the United States," so as to read:

SEC. 10. That the same rights, privileges, and treatment be accorded to alien pilots operating foreign aircraft in this country which the country of that alien extends to licensed pilots of the United States operating their machines in such country, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now, in line 14, page 7, I move to strike out the word "our" after the word "against," and after the word "pilots" to insert the words "of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 7, line 14, after the word "against," strike out the word "our," and after the word "pilots" insert the words "of the United States," so as to read—

except that any prohibition against licensed pilots of the United States shall apply to such alien pilots.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senators who have charge of the pending bill whether it does not seem to them that there is a contradiction between section 6 and section 10 of the measure? Section 6 provides that no aircraft shall be used in this country except the American ownership is clear, which would prohibit the incoming of aircraft from Canada, for example, while section 10 appears to authorize foreign commerce in foreign-owned aircraft. Where there are two sections in flat contradiction with one another, there always remains some doubt as to what construction will be placed upon an act as a whole. I would therefore suggest that it would clear away any possible doubt if there were inserted at the end of line 15 on page 5 the words, in parentheses, "except as provided in section 10 hereof," making it clear that we did not expect to exclude foreign machines in foreign commerce.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no objection to that amendment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Then I move the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 5, line 15, (after the word "commerce," it is proposed to insert the words "(except as provided in section 10 hereof)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I should like to offer the following amendment. I move to insert in section 6, line 15, after the word "commerce," the following, to wit:

If owned and operated by any person, association, or corporation that is engaged in the manufacture and sale of aircraft, and further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Secretary will state.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed to add, after the amendment heretofore agreed to, at the end of line 15 on page 5, the following:

if owned and operated by any person, association, or corporation that is engaged in the manufacture and sale of aircraft, and further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I very much hope, indeed, that the amendment will not be adopted. If agreed to it would absolutely prevent a manufacturer even testing his own machine. He could not put his machine in the air so long as he owned it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If the Senator will permit me, I think the amendment would hardly go that far. The language of the bill is "used in commerce," and "commerce" is defined in the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But there is a definition which reads:

That the word "aircraft" as employed in this act shall embrace every type of flying machine, conveyance, or vehicle now known or hereafter invented, devised, or developed, whether or not used in the carriage or transportation of persons or property or without persons or property.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is the definition of "aircraft."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But in section 6 the language reads:

That no civil aircraft—

Any aircraft of that kind—

shall be used in commerce.

"Commerce" is defined in the bill, and the language of the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska applies only when the aircraft is used in commerce. I am not supporting the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, for I doubt its wisdom, but I think the construction which the Senator from New York puts upon it is a little bit too narrow.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Perhaps I put too severe a construction on the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest that the amendment be again read.

Mr. WILLIS. I suggest that the amendment be read in connection with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be again stated.

The READING CLERK. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska is as given: After the word "commerce," in line 15, on page 5, to insert:

if owned and operated by any person, corporation, or association that is engaged in the manufacture and sale of aircraft, and further.

The amendment heretofore offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and agreed to reads as follows:

(except as provided in section 10 hereof).

Mr. WILLIS. Will the Secretary now read the language of the section as it would be if the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska should be adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That no civil aircraft shall be used in commerce (except as provided in section 10 hereof) if owned and operated by any person, association, or corporation that is engaged in the manufacture and sale of aircraft, and, further, unless owned by a person who is a citizen of the United States or its dependencies.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I should be glad to hear the suggestions of the Senator from Nebraska in favor of his amendment.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I am not especially familiar with the provisions of section 10, but the purpose of my amendment is to prevent developments in commercial aircraft falling into the hands of corporations that are in the business of commercial aviation, thereby preventing the advantages of new inventions being enjoyed by all corporations which are engaged in that line of business. One of the great abuses that have grown up in the United States is the ownership of patents in the hands of operating companies. That practice stifles development, prevents competition, and often segregates and takes away patents and important inventions from the market until such time as the operating company may see fit to use them. If we shall keep operation and ownership and manufacture of this apparatus separate, then there will be an incentive to the manufacturer and the owner of the patent to get out as many machines as possible, to develop them as rapidly as possible, in order that they may enjoy the advantages of the greatest sale and use of their apparatus.

I believe that the proposal I have made is of tremendous importance in a new industry whose limits we can not as yet see. It will merely be in the nature of a proper anchor to leeward, and if in the future it appears that an error has been made, it can be corrected. I sincerely trust that the amendment will be adopted, because I believe the principle is of the greatest importance.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the question which the Senator from Nebraska brings up is of tremendous importance; but for myself I doubt very much the wisdom of inserting any such amendment in the bill. I am not sure that it is possible to draw an analogy between commerce in the air and commerce upon the surface of the earth in this connection, but if that same principle were applied, Mr. President, no railroad company could manufacture its locomotives and use them in running its own railroad; if that same principle were applied, no motor-truck corporation could ever install a line of motor trucks or motor busses through a country district.

I confess I have not given very broad study to the effect of the ownership of patents by manufacturing concerns which thereupon go into the business of performing or rendering services through the instrumentality of the machines or devices which are patented; but I can scarcely agree with the Senator from Nebraska that such an operation discourages inventive genius or enterprise or expansion of business. It may have in many instances exactly the opposite effect.

There is one thing we must remember in connection with commerce in the air, and that is that air routes can not be parceled out to any person or corporation in the terms of a franchise. The air will always be free for people to fly in whenever they learn to fly. The right of way of a railroad corporation must be acquired from the holders of the real estate, and the line of road marked out and the power of condemnation given to the corporation if that is the method of procedure employed in securing the right of way; it must be exercised in such way as to strictly define its rights, to define, as it were, upon the ground itself the route that they are to travel. But in the air, Mr. President, I should hope for a good many years to come we would not invade the field of fran-

chises and charters; and so long as we do not give exclusive right to some person or corporation to fly machines along a given air route, it seems to me that no harm can come of permitting a manufacturer of a machine to fly it.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, it seems to me that in the inception of commercial aviation it may turn out to be very advantageous to the development of the art to permit the manufacturers, who know more about their machines and their capabilities than anybody else, to operate commercial air routes as a demonstration to the rest of the people who at some time or other may want to become interested in it. I take it that the Post Office Department, acting in accordance with the authority granted to them by the Congress, is operating the New York to San Francisco air route not to make money, for it loses money on it, but to demonstrate the possibilities of commercial aviation, the Government of the United States of course being strong enough and in command of sufficient resources and capital to stand the loss while the demonstration is going on. I imagine, however, that the time will shortly come when some manufacturing concern turning out airplanes, or perhaps dirigibles, may desire to prove the usefulness of those machines by installing a test route and demonstrating to the public generally the possibilities of commercial aviation, with the purpose, of course, of developing a market for their products. I would regard it as somewhat unwise to forbid a concern conducting demonstrations of that sort in the interest of their work. We want as many air routes operated by commercial machines as possible.

It is true, as the Senator from Nebraska says, that this art and this means of transportation is in its infancy, but it may grow, indeed I believe it will grow, to immense proportions, and I do not think we should stifle, directly or indirectly, any effort that may be made at the inception of the work. If some great evil grows up 40 or 50 years from now, when commercial aviation shall have become thoroughly established and shall have become a usual method of transportation, then, indeed, the Congress at that time can face the question, but while it is in an experimental stage I hope that no unnecessary impediment will be placed in its way.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I am in sympathy with the view expressed by the Senator from Nebraska. It is not desirable that transportation should get into the control of a few, particularly not into the hands of the manufacturers of the agency of transportation. I suggest to the Senator, however, in line with what has been said by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], that just now the thing that we want is to encourage aviation and the building of aircraft; and it is quite possible, it seems to me, that if his amendment were adopted it would operate greatly to the discouragement of this industry just at its inception.

I think we need not be afraid that future Congresses will fail in their duty in this matter. If it should develop that some manufacturers of aircraft were getting monopolistic control, then I think the legislation suggested by the Senator would be perfectly proper; but personally I doubt the advisability of it now. And then I rather object to the amendment for another reason. I have been trying to read it. I think if the amendment is to be adopted it ought to go in as a separate section of the bill, because if it is adopted here it certainly will leave that section in a very confused state. I believe that in the interest of clarity the amendment in its present form ought not to be adopted.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I should like to add one further thought, or what seems to me to be a thought, on the amendment.

The term "commerce" is defined in section 2 of the bill as meaning "the flying, navigating, or operating of any civil aircraft in interstate or foreign commerce or in, over, or through the District of Columbia, the Territories, dependencies," and so forth. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] were adopted in the form in which he has presented it, it would become illegal for the builder of any aircraft even so much as to fly it in a test flight here in the District of Columbia, or in any Territory, or across any State line.

I am sure that the Senator does not mean his amendment to have that effect. Whether or not his point is sound regarding the desirability of the retention of patents by operating companies seems to me to go very far beyond the scope of this bill and to go to the very heart of our present patent system. Our present patent policy is to give a 17-year monopoly to the originator of any new thought in the arts. Now, it may be that the exercise of that monopoly, by withholding the invention from public use, is an abuse of it; but if so, it ought to be cured by an amendment to the patent laws and not by amendments to

the various bits of legislation that deal with the separate subjects in which patents are valuable.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have very much sympathy with the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska; but I think it should be given consideration in connection with those things that are very likely to develop into monopolies, like the telephone, the telegraph, and things like that, which may be controlled by some particular patent. I do not think there is very much likelihood of a monopoly like that being developed in connection with aircraft, and so I hardly think it would be wise to put this amendment on here. For the reasons stated by others also I think it would be unwise to adopt the amendment to this bill.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I have no particular desire that this amendment should be attached in the manner indicated; but I do feel strongly respecting the protection of new industries and new developments whose limits we can not now foresee.

I realize the force of the remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], to the effect that such amendments might tend to limit developments, and I realize that there is a good deal of sentiment in that direction; but what I have in mind is providing against the development of another monopoly, and the time to do that is in the infancy of any development.

Had this been done in connection with radio, we would not now be confronted with a monopoly of radio not only in the United States but practically throughout the world. The operating companies, the manufacturing companies, are controlling this apparatus to the end that one of the most far-reaching monopolies that ever has been developed in the world is now being developed in connection with radio. When we attempt to disassociate the ownership of these patents and the control thereof from the manufacturing and operating companies we are going up against a stone wall; and yet, if this had been done at the outset, when the present law was adopted, it could have been accomplished with comparatively little effort. To-day, however, we have a monopoly fully developed, with all the power of a monopoly behind it.

That is not the only example in this country. The General Electric Co., together with the Westinghouse Co., is in the fore in the development of electrical machinery; and there is one, just one, subsidiary of the General Electric Co., that has 13 subsidiaries, one of which I am familiar with, because it happens to own an electric-light plant in my own city, that has under its control 192 electric-light plants throughout this country.

What is the result? When one of these plants attempts to buy machinery or needs machinery, it buys practically of the parent company at the prices fixed by the parent company; and the consequence is inflation of the capitalization of the industry.

We are at the threshold of the development of aviation. We do not know where it will go, how far it will develop. Now is the time to protect it against monopoly. Now is the time to close the stable door—not when it has developed into a powerful organization to oppose such legislation. Now is the time to take the necessary steps in this direction by providing that a manufacturing and sales company shall not also be in the transportation business. That is what is proposed by this amendment—keeping the two activities distinct and separate.

I sincerely trust that the Senate will take action at this time, in connection with this initial legislation respecting aviation, to provide against the very thing that has developed in radio, something that we would not have believed possible, because of the small character of the developments, 10 years ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to create a bureau of civil aeronautics in the Department of Commerce, to encourage and regulate the operation of civil aircraft in commerce, and for other purposes."

ORDER OF BUSINESS—EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS obtained the floor.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. DILL. I desire to ask the Senator from Kansas if voting on the chairmanship of the Interstate Commerce Committee is to be discontinued?

Mr. CURTIS. For the day. There will be no vote to-day.

Mr. DILL. The hour is early yet, and the Committee on Interstate Commerce is unable to meet.

Mr. CURTIS. We hope by to-morrow or next day that we can arrange in some manner to get the committee at work. We have been unable to reach an agreement to-day. Usually, when a matter goes over by unanimous consent, it goes over to the next day, and Senators have left with that idea in view. We hope some arrangement will be made in a day or two whereby the committee may get to work. I may say to the Senator that if I were a member of the committee I would have the majority call it together and go to work, whether it had a chairman or not.

Mr. DILL. I may say to the Senator that some such action will be taken unless something is done in this matter.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it ought to be.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive business the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 9, 1924, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 8, 1924.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Earl J. Davis to be Assistant Attorney General.

SOLICITOR FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

John H. Edwards to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES.

Charles H. Moorman to be United States district judge, western district of Kentucky.

Robert A. Inch to be United States district judge, eastern district of New York.

JUDGES OF CIRCUIT COURTS OF HAWAII.

James J. Banks to be third judge, circuit court, first circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

William C. Achi, jr., to be circuit judge, fifth circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Guy H. Martin to be United States attorney for the district of the Canal Zone.

Harry B. Amey to be United States attorney, district of Vermont.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

John W. Van Heuvel to be United States marshal, southern district of Alabama.

J. M. S. Whittington to be United States marshal, western district of Louisiana.

George W. Collier to be United States marshal, district of Maryland.

Robert Kirksey to be United States marshal, western district of South Carolina.

R. Q. Lillard to be United States marshal, middle district of Tennessee.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Clarence F. Buck to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 39, Chicago, Ill.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Arthur M. Teakell to be receiver of public moneys at Douglas, Wyo.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Charles McKinley Saltzman to be Chief Signal Officer with rank of major general.

Jesse Brooke Matlack to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.

Arthur Alexander Hobbs, jr., to be captain, Medical Corps.

Willis Timmons Howard to be chaplain with rank of captain.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

Charles E. Kemp, Trumann.

COLORADO.

William A. Reynolds, Swink.

CONNECTICUT.

Frederick W. Griffin, Cheshire.

FLORIDA.

Thelma Taylor, Alton.

Leo G. Morper, Archer.

Capers S. Weathersbee, jr., Branford.

Clarence O. Gerber, Brewster.

Gabriel I. Daurelle, Bowling Green.

James L. Ambrose, Bunnell.

Walter C. Gholson, Chattahoochee.

Curtis W. Swindle, Chipley.

Lawrence P. Abney, City Point.

John M. McKinney, Cross City.

Edgar T. Hitchcock, Davenport.

Harrison W. Lowe, Daytona.

LeRoy T. Hirth, Delray.

Frederick W. Oren, Florence Villa.

Robert E. Coates, Fort Meade.

Elisha D. Wightman, Fruitland Park.

George R. Millard, Haleah.

Edwin C. Shuler, Hosford.

Ernest B. Wells, Lawtey.

Mabel Miller, Little River.

Mary E. Edwards, Lloyd.

Eugene D. Rosenberger, Micanopy.

Paul R. Whitaker, Monticello.

Samuel J. Yoder, Moore Haven.

Claudia B. DeLaney, Orlando.

Caroline D. Simrall, Ormond.

John B. Jones, Oviedo.

George C. McLarty, Pahokee.

Lola Hershberger, Palm Beach.

William E. Burch, Palmetto.

Lydia E. Ware, St. Andrew.

Joseph P. Hall, Sanford.

Homer T. Welch, Sarasota.

Thomas R. Gamble, Wildwood.

ILLINOIS.

John E. Moyer, Dixon.

George L. Spangler, Franklin Grove.

Walter J. Ehrler, Galena.

Earl L. Longfellow, Rock Falls.

Lewis H. Richards, Scales Mound.

Elmer C. Thorp, Winslow.

MINNESOTA.

George E. Anderson, Austin.

Edwin Nelson, Wendell.

MONTANA.

James H. Hadzor, Sheridan.

Rose C. Spangler, Superior.

NEW YORK.

Robert C. Downey, Akron.

Mabel F. Reynolds, Alfred.

Charles N. Wood, Angola.

Annie J. McFadden, Ardsley.

Joseph A. Douglas, Babylon.

Howard E. Whealey, Baldwin.

Arthur L. Howard, Baldwinsville.

Clarence G. Jones, Barneveld.

Henry B. Mulford, Binghamton.

Vida E. Freeman, Bloomingdale.

Lewis A. Brennemer, Blue Point.

Clayton A. Musser, Boonville.

Maud Rogers, Bridgehampton.

George H. Farley, Broadalbin.

Lowrence R. Ryckman, Brocton.

Adolph Bluestone, Canaseraga.

Edmund B. Windsor, Castile.

Charles W. Brock, Cattaraugus.

Margaret R. Mulligan, Central Islip.

William G. Fisher, Chadwicks.

Benjamin Wightman, Cherry Valley.

Carolyn F. Noxon, Chestertown.

Herbert N. Rothenmeyer, Clarence.

William M. Heaney, Cold Spring Harbor.

Robert D. Southward, Congers.

Clarence L. Grippen, Corinth.

George C. Palmer, Cuba.

Mabel I. Alverson, Dexter.

Rhoda Hoyt Lee, Dundee.

Raymond L. Hodge, East Syracuse.

Ennett J. Goodale, East Williston.

Elmer J. Skinner, East Worcester.

Henry J. Frey, Ebenezer.

George A. Matthews, Eden.

Gaylord F. Carpenter, Elbridge.

Victor Demars, Faust.

Philip F. Schaefer, Fleischmanns.

Walter A. Pierce, Fort Ann.

Hugh A. Prentice, Gainesville.

William A. Patterson, Gansevoort.

Thomas J. Courtney, Garden City.

Edward T. Cole, Garrison.

Paul W. Christenson, Gowanda.

Will E. Roberts, Granville.

Lena B. Gilbert, Groveland (late Groveland Station).

William L. Froehley, Hamburg.

James E. Coigan, Hamden.

Ella E. Rodger, Hammond.

Ray F. Duzlop, Harrisville.

Walter J. Pelham, Hensonville.

Nellie P. Small, Herkimer.

Claude H. Preston, Heuvelton.

Clara E. Tattemer, Hewlett.

Frank W. Thornton, Holland.

Thomas J. Wintermute, jr., Horseheads.

Skidmore Pettit, jr., Jamaica.

Joseph R. Cowell, Jordan.

Herbert L. Merritt, Katonah.

Mae Belle Rozelle, La Fayette.

Lizzie G. Hall, Little Valley.

Henry Strube, Long Island City.

Violet M. Hill, Loomis.

Charles L. Stackpole, Lyon Mountain.

Edward W. Gridley, Macedon.

Katherine A. Slaterry, Maryknoll.

Lizzie M. Tuthill, Mattituck.

Ernest K. Smith, Middleburg.

Leona Larrabee, Middlesex.

Perry R. Bennett, Milford.

Edward Everett, Millerton.

Edith A. Parker, Moravia.

Edward A. Gross, New City.

Ambrose D. Eldred, New Hartford.

Homer E. Elderkin, New Rochelle.

Henry Munday, New York Mills.

Charles H. Brown, Orchard Park.

Carl R. Allen, Oriskany Falls.

James Owens, Ossining.

Anna L. Hunt, Otisco.

William O. Cooper, Oxford.

John T. Mills, Oyster Bay.

John L. Chatfield, Painted Post.

Edward R. Harms, Pearl River.

Frank V. Palmer, Philmont.

Benjamin C. Stubbs, Plandome.

Lida M. Gutches, Port Byron.

George W. Fuller, Portland.

Mabel S. Griswold, Pottersville.

Leverne Thomas, Prattsburg.

Willard G. Bullion, Richfield Springs.

Harry R. Swift, Richford.

Park J. Johnson, Ripley.

Bruce S. Preston, Roxbury.

Max C. Headley, Rushville.

George H. Farley, Sag Harbor.

William J. Pike, Sanborn.

John D. Fratscher, Saugerties.

Clarence A. Lockwood, Schroom Lake.

William H. Savage, Seneca Falls.

Charles L. Carrier, Sherburne.

Frank S. Erickson, Sherman.

William W. Bates, Sidney.

Helen M. Braisted, Silver Bay.

William A. Hilton, Skaneateles.

Armon P. Gunnison, Sodus Point.

William M. Ackerman, Sparkill.

Nellie C. Stevens, Spencerport.

Luther J. Shuttleworth, Springville.

John W. Bellis, Tappan.

Oliver Keator, Tillson.

Marion E. Wroten, Trudeau.

Almon T. Clarke, jr., Tupper Lake.

Frank T. Rowley, Victor.

Ray W. McEwen, Waverly.
Robert L. Putnam, Weedsport.
Julius H. Fisher, Wellsville.
Jennie C. Stanton, West Camp.
George T. Anderson, Whitesboro.
LeRoy Smith, White Plains.
George L. Helfter, Williamsville.
Ada J. Folsom, Winthrop.
John T. Gallagher, Witherbee.
W. Clifton Seaman, Woodmere.
C. Irving Henderson, Worcester.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Ella C. Sweeney, Berthold.
Elizabeth J. Olson, Medina.
Clarence B. Stinson, Warwick.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John B. Kean, Alexandria.
John F. Schwarztrauber, Archbald.
John R. Baltz, Ardmore.
Stanley L. Bechtel, Bally.
Luther F. Gilbert, Boyertown.
Otis J. Pandel, Burnham.
George H. Houck, Cairnbrook.
John K. Hagerty, Chester.
Harry M. Logan, Conshohocken.
Ruth S. Waters, Dallas.
William M. Heaps, Darby.
Hope B. Sterner, Dewart.
James A. Magoun, Dingmans Ferry.
Oscar W. Welsh, Douglassville.
Warren S. Henderson, Downingtown.
Charles R. Kschinka, Dushore.
William R. Colflesh, East Downingtown.
John A. Passmore, Gillett.
William Irey, Glenmoore.
Edward E. Fricker, Glenside.
Warren R. Grove, Greencastle.
Irene M. Tiffany, Hallstead.
Allen L. Shomo, Hamburg.
Theodore J. Reese, Jenners.
Frank E. Tiffany, Kingsley.
Anna R. Parker, Kulpmont.
George J. Thumm, Lansdale.
Harry M. Stauffer, Leola.
Emory B. Collins, Littlestown.
Claude W. Keiser, Lykens.
John Skweir, McAdoo.
Wellesley H. Greathead, McConnellsburg.
Warren Ruth, Malvern.
Henry B. Haines, Maytown.
John L. Eppley, Mechanicsburg.
Mabel S. Wetzel, Middleburg.
William S. Durham, Mont Clare.
Charles B. Bishop, Morton.
John W. Clouse, Moscow.
Phares S. Auxer, Mountville.
William E. Henry, Nazareth.
William E. Marsden, Nesquehoning.
Samuel M. Smith, New Cumberland.
V. Ralph Miller, New Oxford.
Bert D. Stephens, Nicholson.
David B. Seasholtz, North Wales.
Naomi G. Hazell, Norwood Station.
Samuel J. Matthews, Olyphant.
Raymond A. Kistler, Palmerton.
Nora L. Pickering, Peckville.
Emma C. Roseboro, Pomeroy.
George B. Wilcox, Portland.
Howard Sterner, Richlandtown.
Eberhard D. Smith, Sellersville.
Richard L. Harpel, Sinking Springs.
Peter L. Rohrer, Smoketown.
Harry H. Hawkins, Spring Grove.
Robert E. Frech, Stowe.
Thomas Y. Tarlton, Summithill.
Maurice F. O'Connell, Susquehanna.
George N. Turner, Toughkenamon.
Hulett M. Turner, Towanda.
Gordon C. Kuhns, Trevorton.
Jerold J. O'Connell, Valley Forge.
William E. Bowers, Waynesboro.
Charles F. Wenrich, Wernersville.
Wayne Elliott, West Chester.
Susanna S. Hartman, Yardley.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Homer J. Young, Beaufort.
Wauila E. Westbrook, Blacksburg.
Dora Cone Folk, Brunson.
Carl M. Norton, Estill.
Fred L. Timmerman, Graniteville.
Thomas J. Bolin, Neeses.
Josephine B. Pelzer, Pelzer.
Sarah C. Starnes, Ridgeway.
James W. Bradford, Sumter.
John W. Geraty, Yorges Island.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 8, 1924.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Heavenly Father, quicken and deepen the sense of the divine within all of us; make it the dominant note of our being, so we shall be rich in those things that make for peace, justice, and brotherly love toward all men. Kindle the flames of love and devotion upon the altars of our hearts, so that in our hopes and aspirations and longings we shall reach out more and more toward Thee. We pray in the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. KOPP, for the balance of the week, on account of illness, at the request of Mr. DOWELL.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD] may have 10 minutes in which to address the House at the conclusion of the speeches set for to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee requests that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD] be given 10 minutes in which to address the House after the other addresses. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

By special order of the House the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BEEDY] is entitled to one hour. [Applause.]

RUSSIAN SOVIET GOVERNMENT.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in view of the reference made to Russia in the President's message; in view, too, of the subsequent exchange of notes between the foreign office of the Soviet Government and our own State Department; in view also of yesterday's debate in the Senate on Russia's recognition, it may not be amiss for the House to give a few moments' consideration to the so-called Russian question.

Aside from the fact that public interest is focused upon this question because it involves our foreign policy and the relationship between the two Governments, I believe a fairly intelligent comprehension of the Russian problem is the sine quo non to the untangling of the European snarl. The peculiar social life of Russia and her potential capacity for the restoration of trade equilibrium, coupled with the far-reaching consequences of her novel political system, challenge the attention of economists, sociologists, and students of politics.

It was my fortune to visit this Slav country and to travel through European Russia with my wife for upward of 4,000 miles and for a period of one month. I represented no political affiliations, no private business interests, no newspaper, no syndicate of newspapers. I financed my own trip. I represented only myself and family.

I shall attempt in the time at my disposal to explain something of conditions in Russia as I saw them and to state some of the conclusions at which I have arrived, trusting that upon my conclusion you will decide that neither my observations nor my conclusions were colored by bias or prejudice.

I should like you to see this Russia of 1923 against the background of her unusual history. Behold her there, a vast country, more than twice the area of the United States, with a

population variously estimated from 120,000,000 to 150,000,000 of people, comprising 100 races and speaking 40 different tongues. Recollect that up to the time of the ascendancy of Peter the Great, oriental influences molded the life of Russia and have left there to-day a strong imprint. Bear in mind that these Russians have been ruled for 400 years by czars whose policy was characterized by racial repression, inhuman cruelty, gross injustice, and abject tyranny. To foster the ignorance of the masses was a traditional and a well-nigh unmodified policy of czaristic régime. Long ago the ruling classes—and I refer not alone to the nobility but to the army and the more prosperous bourgeoisie—long ago these ruling elements in Russia became unspeakably immoral and corrupt, thereby forfeiting the respect of the masses. Years ago general resentment at the failure of the czars to consider the well-being of the Russian people gave birth to a desire for independence. As far back as the Napoleonic wars contact of the Russian with the French soldiers, flushed with victory in the French Revolution, gave rise to a political ferment which endangered the rule of the first Nicholas. And from the "Decemberist Insurrection" of December, 1825, down to July, 1917, which marked the overthrow and downfall of the last Nicholas, I believe that the whole policy and conduct of the czaristic régime was an adequate justification for its ultimate repudiation. Inhumanities of the czaristic régime, coupled with a moral abandonment and material profligacy, abhorrent and revolting, were the sure forerunners of political and social revolution.

With the foregoing facts as a background, consider the unrivaled daring of a venture to inaugurate the experiment of communism in a land surrounded by capitalistic nations and exhausted by war. Bear in mind, if you will, the further fact that subsequent to Russia's enforced withdrawal from the World War she was compelled to fight the Poles on the west, financed by French capital and aided by French troops; to fight the Finns on the north, financed by German capital and aided by German troops; and at intervals to withstand the ravages of counter-revolutionary armies, financed by foreign capital of numerous origin.

At length she emerged from the contests in which she had withstood the inroads of counter-revolutionary armies led by Udenitch, Kraznov, Wrangell, Kolchak, and Deniken to find that she had been shorn of her corn granaries in the Ukraine, her coal in the Donetz Valley, her iron in the Ural Mountains and in southern Russia, her Baku oil and her cotton in Turkestan. Although a nominal victor in this succession of wars, her transportation system had been disorganized, her social and political system had been shaken to the very foundation, and her credit had become utterly exhausted. Topping all, she faced an economic blockade by the civilized world. Yet to-day, marvel upon marvels, the Soviet Government, one of the oldest in Europe, still continues in power.

This was the Russia which, as an ordinary American man and woman, traveling with Russians, living with Russians, eating the food they ate, seeing the conditions as they saw them—this was the Russia that we entered the latter part of May, 1923.

I remember well my first morning upon the Nevski Prospect. Standing there, the observer of those ragged hordes which passed me by, I questioned whether I was in a civilized nation and whether these undernourished and ragged creatures were conscious of their pitiable condition. If so, what of the poet's song, "God's in His heaven; all's well with the world."

On all sides were evidences of unemployment; buildings were in a sad state of disrepair; windows blown out in the days of the revolution were not yet replaced, except as they were boarded up in some instances. Stores were vacant; the few which were open had small stocks of merchandise, consisting principally of petty finery, impractical of confiscation by the soviet régime. Such, for the most part, constituted the merchandise on sale in commission stores. But wherever a building was available for habitation that building was literally packed with human beings. The housing problem in Russia is not to be spoken of in the same breath with any housing problem which we have ever confronted in this country.

The situation which I saw in Petrograd was typical. My first experience was with a beggar woman, 70 years of age and thinly clad. Without shoes or stockings, she trembled and whined in the cold for a crust of bread. I speak of her because she was but one of thousands whom we met in the course of our travels. I think I may conservatively state that we did not travel 25 rods on a Russian highway, either in village or city, that we were not approached by beggars, either singly or in groups.

How much of this disintegration and decay, how much of this want and misery, was due to the ravages of war and how much

to an attempt to establish a communistic government, of course, opens a wide realm for speculation. It is my personal belief—and I offer it for what it is worth—that Russia has suffered and is now suffering as has no other nation in Europe in recent times. It is my further belief that she suffers more from the ravages of war than from any attempt to practice communism.

I was not content to observe conditions in the old capitals of Russia alone. Our journey led us through Finland and into Russia from the north. From Petrograd we journeyed to Moscow and thence to Nizhni Novgorod. From Nizhni we traveled 900 miles down the Volga, stopping at the various cities and villages en route, and arrived at length in Saratov. From Saratov we traveled by auto across the plains to the German communes. Returning to Saratov, we journeyed thence to Moscow. From Moscow we traveled south through the Ukraine via Kief, and finally reached our port of embarkation, Odessa, on the Black Sea.

Of conditions in Russia as I saw them I undertake to speak without reserve. I paint not alone the dark side of the picture but the brighter side as well. First, let us consider whether Russia is actually making any progress. Of the nations which have suffered from depleted currency in Europe, I think investigation will disclose the fact that Russia is doing quite as much to stabilize her currency as any other nation. I took occasion while in Russia to investigate her currency problem. In an interview with the president of the State Bank I gained the information which I now give to the House.

When the new economic policy came into force in March, 1921, not only was free trade adopted as the internal policy of Russia, not only was private property recognized to the extent of 30,000 golden rubles, but a monetary system and a circulating medium was recognized as necessary to the economic stability of the country. The Russian State Bank was organized with a capital of \$25,000,000. In connection with this bank, but as a distinct department, there was established a department of issue controlled by a board of five men. Two of the members were appointed by the bank, one by the Commissar of Finance, one by the Committee of Workingmen's and Peasants' State Control, and one by the bourse.

This department of issue transfers money to the bank only upon guaranty. The money issued by this department is known as chervontsi. Prior to the threatened break in trade relations between England and Russia it was quoted as high as \$5.12. During the exchange of the Curzon and Chicherin notes it fell to \$4.30. I purchased this chervonetz which I hold in my hand for \$4.40 in American money. I now read the inscription upon its face:

This note is payable in gold, the date of payment to be fixed by a special act of the Government. It is secured by gold bullion, precious gems and metals, foreign securities, and other tangible assets of the State Bank. It is receivable in payment of state taxes and all other taxes payment of which is required to be made in gold.

The security behind this money is gold bullion, silver bullion, and precious gems. The further security nominated "foreign securities" includes two kinds of paper money, and two only, the English and the American. The term "other tangible assets of the State Bank" refers to \$100,000,000 worth of merchandise at all times on hand in the warehouses of the Government trusts of Russia.

In June, 1923, there were issued and outstanding 15,000,000 of these chervontsi, worth 150,000,000 golden rubles, or \$75,000,000 in American money. At the same time, according to the statement of the president of the State Bank of Russia, there were outstanding in all Russia 500,000,000 golden rubles' worth of paper soviet rubles. In other words, by June, 1923, this State Bank, organized in November, 1922, had caused to be transferred by its department of issue and to be injected into the total circulating currency of Russia a secured currency worth approximately one-third of all Russian money issued and outstanding.

The statement made before this House recently that the chervonitz has no value except in Russia is incorrect. It is received at market value by Lloyd's in England and also by the Bank of England. Very little of it comes into the possession of the peasants. Its circulation and use is confined largely to business transactions involving quite some appreciable amounts of money.

The same thing is happening in Russia which happened in Germany. The peasant has been selling his labor and his produce for a rapidly depreciating currency. Some day he will awaken to find his paper soviet rubles absolutely worthless. The secured chervontsi will be the currency of Russia, and the poor peasant will have neither goods nor money. He will be forced to start anew. So much for the State Bank of Russia.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. If the gentleman will excuse me, I should like to conclude and later devote 10 minutes of my time to questions. I think such procedure will be conducive to clearness.

I now wish to call your attention to the cooperative movement in Russia. This experiment is conducted independent of Government aid. The head of the cooperative movement in Russia is not a Government official. To the vice president of the cooperatives I put a question suggested by a speech delivered by Lenin prior to his illness. In that speech Lenin gave some intimation of Government encouragement to the cooperatives. I asked, "Is it true that the Government is to assist the cooperative movement in Russia?" The answer was that the cooperatives wanted no assistance from the Soviet Government but desired only the opportunity to conduct their experiment alone and thus to demonstrate the efficiency of the cooperatives over any Government trust the soviets might administer.

The Centrosyus is the central agency of the cooperative movement in Russia. It purchases all supplies and directs the entire organization. Under its control are 25,000 consumers' societies and 50,000 selling societies. These consumers' and selling societies operate in villages, ministering to the needs of peasants. In the larger centers cooperative unions serve the men and women engaged in industrial pursuits. There are 90 regional unions and 704 subregional unions, all under the control of the Centrosyus.

In the year before the war the total turnover of the Centrosyus was 10,000,000 golden rubles. Last year it aggregated 65,000,000 golden rubles. In March, 1921, the cooperatives' merchandise on hand was valued at only 3,000,000 golden rubles, while in June, 1923, their merchandise on hand was valued at 15,000,000 golden rubles. The total turnover of the selling cooperatives of Russia in 1922 approximated 445,000,000 golden rubles.

Only so late as April, 1922, the cooperatives engaged in foreign trade; yet in the first nine months their total sales in foreign markets amounted approximately to \$9,000,000. The figures for the last year are not at hand, but I think you will find that the cooperatives of Russia during 1923 sold in foreign markets approximately \$18,000,000 worth of merchandise. This cooperative movement in Russia is worthy of close observation and study.

Russia is making material and constructive progress. I am informed by disinterested observers that conditions to-day are vastly improved over those of two or three years ago. Law and order now prevail throughout European Russia. The Russian towns and cities which we visited were as well ordered as the cities and villages in any country. Policemen patrolled the public streets. In the main thoroughfares traffic was directed by special traffic officers, and the streets were regularly swept by members of the street-cleaning departments. At all hours, both at night and by day, Mrs. Beedy and myself traveled in perfect safety and rarely with soviet guides. In fact, soviet guides attended us only in isolated instances. Our guides for the most part consisted of American relief workers. By this I would not have it understood that soviet officials were neglectful or discourteous. Soviet guides were always at our disposal, and all Government officials were exceedingly courteous.

Much has been said about the religious persecution in Russia. The Greek Orthodox Church was formerly part and parcel of the czaristic régime. It was naturally the object of great suspicion, and whenever evidence was actually uncovered proving that priests in the Greek Orthodox Church were conspiring with alien enemies for the overthrow of the Soviet Government, they were arrested and their churches were closed. Some priests received prison sentences and some were shot for treason. In the great majority of cases, however, upon promise of priests to cease their hostile plotting and to support the Soviet Government, they were granted their freedom and their churches were opened.

Religious worship is not encouraged in Russia. It is more accurate to state that it is tolerated. While in Moscow I saw, near the gate which leads into the Red Square, that notorious sign, "Religion is the people's opium." Prior to my arrival in Petrograd the figures of Christ and a capitalist in effigy were dragged through the streets. However, despite the fact that religion is tolerated rather than encouraged the Russian people as a whole are apparently very reverent. The Russian working man or peasant rarely passes a cathedral without doffing his hat and crossing himself many times. We attended divine services in the Russian churches, which were uniformly well filled with worshippers and in which elaborate services were being conducted without interference by the Government.

The Communist Party of Russia, consisting of 400,000 members, is in absolute control of the Soviet Government. To its membership are admitted only those who, having been put upon probation, are found to be wholly trustworthy. But irrespective of his other qualifications, it is a fact that no member of a church will be admitted to membership in the Communist Party. Aye more! A man not a church member will nevertheless be excluded from the Communist Party if he marries a woman who belongs to a church. And, again, more! Though neither man nor woman belong to a church, should their child be christened in a church the man is barred from membership in the Communist Party. And since, generally speaking, only communists attain to high position in the Government, it is a fact that the policies of the Soviet Government in Russia are determined by men who are professed atheists and agnostics. For this reason, if for no other—although I am not prone to boast of my religious scruples, possessing merely as profound a reverence for things spiritual and religious as the average man—for this reason I shall never raise my voice within the walls of this Chamber or elsewhere to urge my people through recognition to put the stamp of American approval upon this godless government of Russia. [Applause.]

However, we shall do well to bear in mind that the Russian people are not responsible for the atheism of the soviet leaders. They can in no sense be held any more responsible for the present tyranny of the communists than for the iron rule of the czars in years gone by. In this connection it is but fair to the present Government of Russia to state my opinion that any government which attempted to rule Russia with other than the firmest hand could not retain its power for six months.

Though I can not advocate full recognition of the Russian Government I do believe that America should pursue a policy of humane consideration for the Russian people. In the wisdom of an All-Wise Providence 130,000,000 people, now ruled by the soviets, were born in Russia. Surely they were less fortunate in the circumstance of birth than the millions who chanced to be born in a country where life is more worth the living. America claims to be a Christian Nation. She proclaims herself a leader. As such let her recognize the God-given right of all races to live and to utilize freely the channels of international trade. Surely America is too great a Nation either by reason of racial prejudice or for any other consideration to fail in the taking of any step which may serve to stimulate international trade and thereby alleviate the distress of a long-suffering people.

America's present policy of absolute aloofness, supplemented by the assertions of her officials that they are placing no restrictions in the way of trade with Russia, is in no way adequate to the situation. Nor should we consider the advisability of encouraging trade with Russia from the viewpoint of financial returns. The volume of Russia's foreign trade has never been surprisingly large. Prior to the war her total foreign trade was but 4 per cent of the total international trade of the world. With respect to platinum, she enjoyed a monopoly, furnishing 95 per cent of the world's output. She occupied a unique position in the production of flax in that she supplied a quality which no other nation has ever substituted. Of her total trade, cereals averaging an annual value of \$500,000,000 constituted more than one-half. Europe was the principal market for her bread grains, purchasing an average of 160,000,000 bushels annually.

At this point let me assert my belief that in the consideration of trade problems there is too general a tendency to overestimate the physical and chemical properties of merchandise and to underestimate the exchange processes, of which commodities are merely the physical aspects. Permit me to illustrate. From the years 1907 to 1914 our average export of bread grains to Europe was 3,125,000 long tons. Russia's annual average export of bread grains to Europe in the same period was 5,000,000 long tons. But from the years 1915 to 1922 our annual average export of this same grain was 6,435,000 long tons. You will perceive that during this last-named period America had taken upon herself two-thirds of Russia's task of supplying the bread grains needed by Europe. You say, Excellent! America has increased her export trade; Europe's needs have been met; Russia alone suffers. If such is your conclusion, I submit that it is wrong. When Russia's trade normal is disturbed Europe suffers, and likewise America.

So delicately interwoven is the network of international trade that no one nation can depart from normal without adverse consequences to other nations. I need but call your attention to the decade of the eighties, when the Argentine was seized with a speculative mania and flooded with cheap paper money. The evil consequences of the ill-advised speculation were not confined within her own borders. They produced an

adverse effect upon the money exchanges in America and culminated with the failure of Baring Bros. in England.

Again, let me call your attention to the financial difficulties of Japan in 1906, the evil consequences of which contributed to the American panic of 1907. The reverberations of this latter crisis were felt throughout the entire world, affecting adversely the caravan trade from central Africa across the Sahara Desert to Tripoli.

War and communism, for the time being, have crippled Russia's productive capacity and thereby her purchasing power. Because of her inability to pay, Russia did not purchase of India or China in 1921 the tea which she had formerly purchased. Were the adverse consequences of this diminished trade in tea confined to Russia, India, or China? Far from it. It resulted that neither India nor China purchased of England their former volume of manufactured cotton goods. This consequence contributed to the idleness of spindles and the unemployment of labor in England. And England, forced to curtail her purchases of raw cotton, assisted in damming up this cotton in the countries of origin.

The impairment of Russia's productive capacity forced Europe to turn elsewhere for her supply of grain. Formerly Russia constituted Europe's chief source of supply for bread grains.

We now know that it was a comparatively easy task for America, by the extension of her cultivated areas, to assist in the replacement of Russian bread grains. But other complications arose. Europe had been accustomed to pay for Russia's grains with the manufactured goods which her factories were tooled to supply. Russia had and still has the consumptive capacity for many of Europe's manufactured products. America, however, though capable of increasing her output of bread grains, found it impossible, confronted with her prevailing standards of high living, to increase her consumptive capacity sufficiently to absorb an abnormal influx of Europe's manufactured goods. We therefore refused payment in European manufactured goods and demanded Europe's gold for our bread grains. Meanwhile we were demanding of Europe payment of her debts incurred during the war, while by our insistence on payment for our export grains in gold we speeded the depletion of Europe's gold supply until she found herself unable to pay even the interest on our loans.

The Russian question, from the viewpoint of trade, presents a problem in international commerce. Russia's economic reconstruction is the keystone to the economic reconstruction of Europe. I believe these to be the undisputed conclusions of all reputable political economists.

Russia herself, as she has made free trade her internal policy, must denationalize her foreign trade; she must permit individuals and private concerns to buy and sell in the markets of the world on their own responsibility. When and only when the Russian Government shall have taken such a step do I advocate the negotiation of a trade agreement with Russia and the sending to that country of a nonpartisan American trade commission. It is America's bounden duty to exert her every influence to bring about a modification in the foreign-trade policy of the Russian Government and to make every attempt in a wholly unselfish manner to adjust this world problem in commerce. [Applause.]

Yet, another objection to the full recognition of the present Russian Government: I am in hearty accord with the position taken by our Secretary of State. I would never favor Russia's recognition until she has returned to American nationals their confiscated property now in existence. [Applause.] This step once taken as an evidence of Russia's good faith and we should be ready to take our place about the council table and adjust the question of damages involved in property destroyed.

Last June in an interview at Moscow with Mr. Chicherin, Minister of Foreign Affairs, I put this question squarely, "You are anxious, sir, for the recognition of your Government by America, are you not?" "Most assuredly," he replied. "Are you ready, then," I inquired, "to return existing property now under your control which you confiscated from American nationals?" His reply was unevasive. He said, "Mr. BEEDY, we can not do that. We came into power on a platform which did not recognize private property, and the moment we make unconditional return of American property we must accord the same treatment to other foreign nationals. Such a policy would forfeit us the support of those who now maintain us in power."

In my opinion, the Soviet Government, so long as it holds to its present tenets, will never restore to American nationals their property which it confiscated.

I read you from Part I, chapter 2, section (d) of the soviet constitution now in force:

The Third All-Russian Congress of Soviets regards the law repudiating the debts contracted by the government of the Tsar, the landlords, and the bourgeoisie as a first blow at international financial capitalism; and it expresses its entire confidence that the Soviet Government will continue firmly in this direction until the international revolt of the workers against the yoke of capitalism shall have secured a complete victory.

Here in the fundamental and constitutional law of the Soviet Republic we find adequate phraseology to justify the assertion that not only is the Soviet Government opposed to the recognition of private property and the sanctity of private contract but it is squarely committed to the purpose of promoting a world revolution. And this leads me to the discussion of a further reason for my opposition to the recognition of Russia.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 25 minutes more.

Mr. BEEDY. Thank you.

I shall continue my unalterable opposition to the recognition of the Soviet Government until she has ceased directly and indirectly to spread her revolutionary propaganda in America. There has been much denial by the soviets of any responsibility for communistic and revolutionary propaganda in this country. It was, however, admitted on the floor of this House by the estimable gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] in his admirable address of recent date that the Soviet Government appropriated \$1,000,000 in 1917 for world propaganda. The gentleman then added the following: "But 95 per cent of it went into Australia and Germany."

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. BEEDY. If the gentleman will excuse me and take the matter up later, I would prefer it.

Mr. FREAR. I want to say that that was during time of war.

Mr. BEEDY. It was in 1917, as I have stated.

The assertion that 95 per cent of this soviet appropriation went into Germany and Austria does not wholly abate my interest in the use which was made of the other 5 per cent.

So far as I myself am concerned, I do not hesitate to say that my regard for my country and our form of government is such that even if 1 per cent of the million dollars in question came into this country and was disbursed by soviet sympathizers to stir up revolution here I resent it as an unfriendly act. [Prolonged applause.]

I now desire to read from a series of six articles, the result of investigations conducted by the United Mine Workers of America which were published late in 1923. Although many public statements charging the Soviet Government with unfriendly propaganda have been promptly controverted, that Government, so far as I am informed, has not denied the statements which I now read:

The overthrow and destruction of this Government (referring to America), with the establishment of an absolute and arbitrary dictatorship and the elimination of all forms of popular voice in governmental affairs, is being attempted on a more gigantic scale, with more resolute purpose, and with more crafty design than at any time in the history of this Nation.

The communist régime at Moscow, bent on world conquest, is promoting and directing one of the best-organized and most far-reaching campaigns in America that any country has ever been confronted with.

Collection of money from the American people for the promotion of the revolutionary movement in this country has become an organized industry in the last two years.

The sum which is being annually derived in this manner runs into millions of dollars, with only an approximate idea as to its aggregate. In addition millions of dollars are being sent over from Moscow and other Bolshevik centers in European capitals.

The United Mine Workers learns from an authoritative source that the money from abroad is coming in through the usual international banking channels, originating in Moscow, Berlin, or Stockholm, and it is distributed to the accounts of various individuals in different banks after it reaches this country.

I quote further from the same source:

Conducting and promoting the revolutionary campaign in the United States is a secret party organization, directed and controlled by representatives of the Communist International. This is the Communist Party of America. * * * This party has at its head the supreme executive revolutionary committee in America, responsible only to Lenin, Zinoviev, and other officials of the Communist International. It does not recognize any superior power or agency in the United States.

According to the above report—

The major points in this revolutionary program of the communists * * * are:

1. Overthrow and destruction of the Federal, State, and provincial Governments, with the elimination of existing constitutional forms and foundations.

2. Establishment of a soviet dictatorship absolute in its exercise of power, owing allegiance to, and conceding the authority only of, the Communist or Third International at Moscow as a "governmental" substitute.

3. Destruction of all social, economic, and political institutions as they exist at this time.

4. Seizure of all labor unions through a process of "boring from within" them, and utilizing them as a strategic instrument in fulfillment of their revolutionary designs upon organized and constitutional government.

5. Invasion of the United Mine Workers of America, with the ouster of its present officials and leaders and the substitution of a leadership of communists that it may be used as an instrumentality for seizing the other labor unions of America and for eventually taking possession of the country.

6. A well-organized movement is being promoted within the 4 railroad brotherhoods and 16 railroad trade-unions to amalgamate all railroad workers into "one departmentalized industrial union" controlled by a single leader of communist principle and affiliation and owing allegiance to the communist organization.

7. Seizure of the American Federation of Labor, with the ouster of its officials, and through such seizure gaining control of all its affiliated units and trade-unions.

8. Conversion of all craft trade-unions into single units of workers within an industry known as "industrial unions," with coordination under a supersoviet union owing allegiance to, and accepting the mandates of, the Communist International and its subsidiary, the Red Trade-Union International at Moscow.

9. Through conquest and subjugation of the labor unions and conversion and mobilization of farmers and other related groups the overthrow of existing institutions and the creation of a condition similar to that which now prevails in Russia.

This is the alleged program of the Communist Party in America. But the Communist Party in America is directed by the Communist International, which, in the words of Radek, "was founded in the Kremlin on the institution of the Communist Party of Russia." The Soviet Government, the Communist Party of Russia, and the Communist International have been openly conceded by Zinoviev to be one and the same.

In his report at the fourth congress of the Communist International he states:

It is, to be sure, clear that an important and very close interdependence exists between the first Proletariat Republic and the Communist Party, which fights against the bourgeoisie. Such an interdependence should exist and must exist. From our communistic standpoint it is clear that the Communist International is important for Soviet Russia, and vice versa. It would be laughable to ask who has the advantages, who is subject, and who is object. It is the foundation and the roof of one building. One belongs to the other.

You will note that the terms Proletariat Republic, Communist Party, and Communist International are used interchangeably in this report. It is idle to deny that the aims and the objects of the one are not the aims and objects of the other.

Members of the Congress recently received copies of a letter from the general secretary of the executive committee of the Communist International, W. Kolarow. Referring to recent efforts of General Pershing to create a demand for a larger American Army, this letter exhorts American communists that they "must sound the alarm and prepare the workers for resistance to these bloody schemes." This letter is addressed to the "Workers Party of America," sometimes known as the "Illegal Party." It is in fact the Communist Party of America. But inasmuch as membership in that party has been held by our Federal courts to be sufficient grounds for deportation, the Communist Party of America assumes the name of "The United Workers of America."

The United Workers of America for some time past have published a weekly paper in this country known as "The Worker." A campaign has recently been conducted in America to raise a fund of \$100,000 for the purpose of making this weekly paper a daily. I hold in my hand an issue of "The Worker," under date of November 3, 1923, the anniversary of that day on which the Soviet Government of Russia came into power.

As a sample of the so-called news which this paper is feeding out to the American public I call your attention to the following. Extending across the entire front page of this issue there appears, in red ink and in inch and one-half type, the following: "Coolidge's World Conspiracy!" This front-page article is calculated to incite the workmen of America to revolt

against our Government by convincing them that under President Coolidge's lead and influenced by capitalism we—

have devised the most enormous conspiracy * * * to rescue capitalism in Germany through a big international loan and to prepare a new invasion against Russia * * *.

The article further continues—

Calvin Coolidge is in his element at last. * * * In 1918 Wilson declared to the German people that it could not have peace before it drove out the Kaiser and the Hohenzollern dynasty. In 1923 Calvin Coolidge declares to the German people that they can not receive a piece of bread as long as they do not restore the monarchy, the Kaiser, and the Hohenzollern dynasty.

This so-called news contains as little truth as the average item appearing in this paper, a paper whose aim is to undermine the confidence of the masses in American Government and hasten the day of wholesale revolution. I repeat: This is the paper which the Communist International (created and sponsored by the Soviet Government of Russia) is making a daily rather than a weekly publication.

As an humble Member of this lower branch of the American Congress I welcome this opportunity of stating my conviction that the Soviet Government of Russia ought not to be recognized until she stops sponsoring this diseased and vicious propaganda. [Applause.]

What is the prime aim of this Soviet Government of Russia? The justification for its very existence has been its boasted capacity for bettering the conditions of labor. Its claim has been that the American Government, which it classes as a capitalistic government, deprives labor of its just deserts and has thrown her entire social order into such a state of maladjustment that the Soviet Government must needs rescue our social structure and bring the proletariat into its own.

While in Russia I was interested to learn just what returns their Government industries were yielding to labor. Among other industrial plants which I visited was a cotton mill. It was the finishing mill for the output of four other mills, and with them constituted a part of the Russian Cotton Syndicate, which in turn is an arm of the Russian Textile Trust. And at this juncture I may be permitted to say that which perhaps is more or less commonly known, namely, that since the institution of the new economic policy in March, 1921, the Soviet Government no longer invades the entire field of industry. It confines itself to the operation of public utilities and the so-called basic industries, among which is classed the manufacture of cotton and woolen goods. Many of these so-called basic industries, including mining and the manufacture of necessities, are the subject of Government concession to private capital and are operated in conjunction with private capital on a profit-sharing basis. The manufacture of textiles, however, is a purely governmental industry, and the wage standard therein obtaining is that commonly obtaining in all soviet-controlled industries.

The superintendent of the mill in question, a communist of 24 years' standing, received the maximum wage paid by the Soviet Government in industrial pursuits, or 5,300,000,000 soviet rubles, which, according to the then existing rate of exchange, amounted to \$35 per month.

In company with the superintendent, who took us through this mill, were three heads of departments, all graduates of universities, and neither of them communists. These men received a monthly wage of 5,000,000,000 soviet rubles, or \$33.33. (One American dollar was then—June 19, 1923—worth 150,000,000 soviet rubles.) The skilled workers at the looms were paid 2,800,000,000 soviet rubles, or \$18.66, per month. Unskilled labor, including shippers and draymen, received 600,000,000 soviet rubles, or \$4, per month. In addition, each workman was supplied with working clothes, consisting of a loose blouse and breeches of overall material, while the head of each family of three was entitled to one room for the family home.

In his recent address upon this floor, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FEAR], in citing the deplorable labor conditions in czaristic Russia which justified the revolution of 1917, said:

In 1912, when raw labor commanded \$1.65 per day in the industrial centers of the United States, Russian labor, we learn, received 30 cents per day with which to feed and clothe a family.

Gentlemen of the House, last summer in Samara I saw hundreds of Russians in a line extending from the Government employment bureau to the sidewalk and some distance down the street. Those ragged and undernourished Russians were waiting for some employment by the Government, which was apparently impossible of procurement, but which if secured

would have yielded them 20,000,000 soviet rubles, or less than 14 cents per day. At the same time unskilled labor in America was and still is receiving from \$4 to \$6 per day. These are illustrations of the share in the profits of industry enjoyed by labor after six years of Soviet Government control.

Nor is the whole story told when attention is called to the low wage scale obtaining among Russian workers. The mines of Russia are operating at only one-third their pre-war output. Manufacturing interests in general are producing barely 50 per cent of their pre-war output. The cotton mill just referred to was producing barely half its pre-war output. The superintendent, however, informed me that their low output and their inability to meet the demand for cotton textiles was due to their inability to purchase raw cotton from Turkestan, their chief source of supply prior to the war. He informed me that whereas Russia imported 19,000,000 pounds of raw cotton in 1913, that in the first six months of 1923 she would import barely 3,500,000 pounds. Whatever may have been the real explanation for the deplorable conditions existing in Russian industry and among Russian labor, the fact remains that communism and the Soviet Government have thus far failed to fulfill the mission of their conception.

One other word and I am done. There is one view of this entire situation which if it has not escaped observation has at least escaped mention. We have not yet rounded out the half-cycle of a second century under our American Constitution. Despite our many errors our governmental achievement has been highly creditable. Historians point out many warning beacons along the broad pathway of human experience. The comparatively recent revolution in Russia affords a notable object lesson by which America may well profit. The psychology of that revolution, as I view it, is simple.

Men will submit to be governed so long as the governing class is moral, incorrupt, and mindful of its own laws. Those less fortunate in natural endowments and the measure of worldly possessions will submit to the enjoyment of wealth by others so long as those others are decent and mindful of their obligations to society. It was 400 years before the rotten crust of czarism cracked and the corrupt, immoral, upper classes became a prey to the furies of the mob. The long-suffering Russian peasant would no longer tolerate the inhumanities and the lawless immoralities of corrupted wealth and an unconscionable Government. Reaching out their bloody hands they seized this thing called government and they clutched at the thing called wealth. In the exultation of revolutionary delirium they appropriated both and behold the misery which they have wrought in an already war-ridden country.

Under the American Government the individual is entitled to the fruits of his toil. For the first time in the history of the world the first 10 amendments to the American Constitution laid out an area within which no tyrant power may set foot to the detriment of the humblest citizen of the Republic. In 6,000 years of recorded history the genius of man evolved no nobler conception of lawful social order than that embodied in our Constitution.

At this period in our Nation's history let us not indulge ourselves in the opium fumes of self-complacency. Let us catch the vision which the wealth and governing power of Russia missed. Let us understand once and for all time that governing power and wealth come to men, not for their own selfish satisfactions but merely as a medium to accomplish the general betterment of mankind. The men and women who wield the power and enjoy the wealth in America will ultimately pay a sad penalty if they harbor the idea that they are at any time a privileged class, exempt from the operation of law, civil and moral. [Applause.]

There are some clouds upon our national horizon. It is indeed a sad commentary upon world government that 2,000 years since the Savior of mankind pointed out the way for nations Russia should experience so little of the joy of living. It is likewise a shameful commentary upon the justness of our own social system that such extremes of wealth and poverty are suffered to exist as those now obtaining on Fifth Avenue and the east side of New York City.

My friends, revolutions are not made to order. They do not come in a night. They are phenomena in the complex processes of social evolution. The clouds upon the American horizon may be observed long prior to the outburst of the storm. The American public is thoughtful, intelligent, and long suffering. We who have taken upon ourselves the responsibilities of government must foresee the necessity of effecting a more and more equitable distribution of the profits of industry. The accumulation of swollen fortunes, amounting to the hundreds of millions of dollars, ought not, under our scheme of govern-

ment, to be legally applicable to the selfish satisfactions of an individual. [Applause.]

I am not a radical. I am a conservative. The men of Maine keep their feet upon the ground, but the far-seeing conservative, heedful of future dangers, will counsel a public policy calculated to break down class barriers and breed increasing respect for government under law.

On that never-to-be-forgotten day in June, when from the deck of an American destroyer the coast line of far-off Russia faded from my horizon, I understood, as I never understood before, the privileges and the incident responsibilities of American citizenship.

Men and women of America, mark well the sad fate which has befallen Russia. Apprise well your liberties under the Constitution of this Republic. Stop whining about the inefficiency of your legislative bodies. They are your own creatures. You are alone responsible for them. Abandon your passivity and avail yourselves of the ballot to better American government. [Applause.] Shake off your indifference to civic responsibility lest you contribute to the failure of our experiment in self-government, a failure which, if it shall come, in my humble opinion will remove the last best hope of civilized nations in the cause of sane and humane government. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Certainly; if I have time.

Mr. FREAR. I want to say this. I have enjoyed extremely the remarks of the gentleman from Maine. I ran across his whereabouts frequently in going through Russia and know he has made a very full study of conditions, and I agree with much he has said, although not entirely in conclusions. There is only one suggestion I want to make now, and that in quoting me that \$1,000,000 was expended by the Government of Russia, the only time I understand it was appropriated was for propaganda during 1917, and it was then used practically entirely on its borders during the war with Germany and Austria. At the same time the United States and Great Britain were doing precisely the same thing in trying to disorganize Germany with propaganda. That is the propaganda they were exerting at that time. I agree with the gentleman that so far as propaganda is concerned in time of peace it ought not to be exercised, and I think every good American citizen agrees, and I desire to compliment the gentleman upon his splendid speech.

Mr. BEEDY. I think the House will bear me out when I say that I made no statement inconsistent with what the gentleman from Wisconsin has now stated.

Mr. BERGER. Is the gentleman aware that the reports quoted as emanating from the Mine Workers' Union have been repudiated by the mine owners—that is, by the employers' or operators' association? Are you aware of that?

Mr. BEEDY. I am not, but I should think if any denial were to be made it would come from those most concerned, namely, the Soviet Government, which is the party accused.

Mr. BERGER. The Soviet Government has had no opportunity.

Mr. BEEDY. They have answered by cable and through their press numerous other accusations, and they have never lost any time in doing it before.

Mr. BERGER. But it was repudiated by the mine owners.

Mr. BEEDY. So you have stated.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has stated that he will never be in favor of the recognition of Russia until that Government is willing to restore to the American nationals the value of the property confiscated. The gentleman said that.

Mr. BEEDY. I did not make just that statement.

Mr. BLANTON. About that, was it not—restoration of the property?

Mr. BEEDY. Restoration of the property itself.

Mr. BLANTON. And then in that connection the gentleman said that from his investigation he knows that it will be impossible for that Government to make a restoration of the property.

Mr. BEEDY. My impression is that the Russian Government will not make such restitution until it changes its program.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the result is that this Government can never recognize that Government.

Mr. BEEDY. Not if it persists in its adherence to its present tenets. It ought to modify them.

Mr. BLANTON. I am in general agreement with the gentleman.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. The gentleman has said that we should lead the way by making it impossible for one man to accumulate \$100,000,000 and pass it on to succeeding generations. Will the gentleman agree to levy a capital tax? If not, what remedy would he suggest?

Mr. BEEDY. The gentleman misunderstood. My objection went not so much to its accumulation as to the uses to which it might legally be put. I am not prepared to commit myself to the capital tax.

Mr. KVALE. What is the gentleman's objection to a capital tax?

Mr. BEEDY. I have not made a special study of the capital tax, and no man should go off half-cocked on tax problems. Therefore I shall not now commit myself. Permit me to say that we have established a significant precedent in a certain section of the interstate commerce act—an act decreed by the railroads in the first instance, but an act which we are now besought not to modify. That act provides that when the railroads of the country shall earn returns exceeding 6 per cent on the invested capital one-half the excess may be distributed, through Government agency, among needy roads. That is a very significant piece of legislation.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Does the Russian Government recognize what we call religious liberty?

Mr. BEEDY. Certainly not what we call religious liberty. Although everybody is free to attend church, nobody is permitted to join the Communist Party which belongs to a church. Another thought! Upon the conclusion of the "Red terror" bald-faced murdering of the nobility and bourgeoisie ceased. To-day nobody will be employed in Russia who does not belong to a labor union, and nobody will be admitted to a labor union if he is a bourgeois. Most of us here would be classed as bourgeois and for that reason would not be given employment in Russia. In brief, the Russian bourgeoisie under the Soviet Government to-day faces extinction by a slow process of starvation.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is it not true that all the churches in Russia were sacked and looted?

Mr. BEEDY. It is true that the churches were looted and their altar pieces confiscated. One of the metropolitans of the Greek Orthodox Church, who had sworn allegiance to the Soviet Government, when questioned with reference to this very thing referred me to the fact that Catherine the Great established a precedent in her time and sacked the Russian churches of that day. I presume this metropolitan felt that such an explanation would be entirely convincing to an humble member of this Government. The present Russian Government claims that it sacked the churches in order that it might sell the church valuables to meet the needs of the famine-stricken Russians. [Applause.]

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I believe there are other speeches to be made. When those are concluded, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JEFFERS] may have 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the speeches already arranged for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JEFFERS] may have 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. By formal order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] has 15 minutes.

ERECTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a great daily paper published in the city of Washington, in its issue of last Sunday printed a column article, under flaming headlines, which I will now read to the House:

House pork-barrel scheme as a barrier to a public-building program. Langley opposed to giving the District preference in improvements. Favors taking care of home needs also. Only hope for \$50,000,000 project thought to lie in omnibus bill.

The first paragraph of the article under the headlines is as follows:

Indications yesterday were that the \$50,000,000 public-building program for the District is destined to die at the hands of the pork-barrel brigade in the House unless the administration agrees to some sort of an omnibus public buildings bill.

As I have introduced no bill for the erection of any public building at the present session of Congress, I suppose that I am

not, therefore, a member of the pork-barrel brigade here referred to. I therefore speak not as one under personal criticism. For the benefit of many Members of the House who have recently become Members I want to say that it has been a good many years since an omnibus public building bill was passed through Congress. I do not recall just how long it has been, but probably it has been 15 years, although there has been much need for the erection of many public buildings throughout the country.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. To be accurate, the last public building bill was approved March 4, 1913, which would be a little less than 11 years ago. I feel that I should make that statement. The interval is entirely too long, of course.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the gentleman for making that statement.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. HUDSPETH. As I have introduced bills to establish post-office buildings in almost every town in my district I would be eligible for membership in that class.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; you would be considered a porker. During the period of the war and up until the spring of 1921 I was a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds; during the same period of time I was also a member of the District Committee and chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing. I had many occasions to make some investigations with reference to the building needs of the District of Columbia and also with reference to the needs of that small portion of the United States which lies beyond the boundaries of the District of Columbia. During this time no public buildings bills for that remote section of the country beyond the District line have been authorized by Congress and no buildings have been erected. Still, the evidence before our committee showed that there were hundreds and thousands of cases that were considered emergencies.

I recall the city of Baltimore as being one. We went over there with a committee, under the guidance of the distinguished gentleman from that city, Mr. LINTHICUM, and we inspected the post-office building there. We found from the evidence brought before us that during the war the postal activities of the city of Baltimore increased in greater proportion than those of any other city in the United States, yet they had the same old building which they had had there for many years. It was a beehive of activity wherever there was room for activity. However, it was so congested that there was scarcely room enough to perform one-half of the work that was absolutely necessary to be carried on there. Every nook and corner and every crack, crevice, and cranny of the building from cellar to garret was literally congested, with scarcely room enough for the operatives to do their work. The committee came back and very promptly agreed to report a bill authorizing \$1,000,000 for the enlargement of that building. That was just one instance.

Take Akron, the great center of the rubber industry of the world, where nearly all of the automobile tires are made. It was shown to us that Akron had greatly increased in proportion to other cities; that the population had doubled within a very few years and that the postal activities there had increased tenfold in a comparatively short period of time. Yet at that time they were without a building which was sufficient for their work.

Those are just a few instances, although there were hundreds of them, and the evidence brought before the committee showed that in some instances outhouses and sheds adjoining and adjacent to the post-office buildings had been brought into play in order to house the activities of the Government there. In one instance which I recall they said that a part of the postal work had to be done out on the sidewalk under an awning. Still we authorized no public buildings. The burdens of taxation rested so heavily upon the people of this country that the Congress thought it best, in its wisdom and judgment, to let this matter wait for a few years until these burdens could be removed.

But when it came to the District of Columbia, I want to call your attention to the fact that a different rule was applied. We went right ahead erecting public buildings in this city at enormous expense, and never even stopped during the war. I was a member of the committee when we authorized the erection of the annex to the Treasury, across the Avenue from the main Treasury Building and connected with it by a subway. That annex was erected at a cost of some two or three million dollars, the exact amount I do not recall. We authorized in a bill the purchase of the old Arlington

Hotel building and the completion of a new building at a cost of more than \$1,000,000. That bill, however, never became a law because the President thought he could not wait for the machinery of legislation, but purchased the building outright and completed it out of the \$100,000,000 war fund which we had placed in his hands. It is now the home of the Veterans' Bureau.

I was a member of the committee which made a report for the expenditure of \$10,000,000 in this city during the war for the erection of brick buildings in connection with the navy yard, and for various other buildings in the city necessary for war activities. In addition, the President spent many, many millions of dollars in this city erecting office buildings, some of them of a temporary character but some of them of a permanent character, including the Munitions Building, which was erected on the Potomac Park grounds, covering 13 acres of land and, as I am told, being the largest office building upon the whole face of the earth. I do not know just the figures, but I would say that altogether nearly \$100,000,000 has been spent in this District for the erection of public buildings since any amount whatever has been authorized for any other section of the country.

These are things, gentlemen, that ought to be thought about. I want to tell you that when you read articles of this kind in the papers of the city of Washington they do not reflect the truth, and the Members of this Congress, the people of this city and of this country ought to have some way of ascertaining the truth in regard to these things.

Now, we are confronted with the proposition that if we want to build a few necessary post offices, customhouses, or court-houses in the United States anywhere we must include in a bill of that kind \$50,000,000 of pure "pork" to the District of Columbia before they will permit us to do so. [Applause.] I do not know whether it would be fair to call that "pork" or not. As I understand a "porker," he is a man who is willing to go on a 50-50 proposition with you; give him \$1,000,000 and he will give you \$1,000,000, and so on; but these fellows do not want to do that; they want to hog it all. It is not "pork"; it is "hog." [Laughter.]

I do not know the sentiment of the Members of this House, but, to be fair and honest and candid, my judgment is that the District of Columbia can very well afford to wait a few years now until the rest of the United States catches up with it in this respect. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. We would have to wait 100,000 years if we did that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Possibly a million, and then you would be no nearer the point, perhaps. [Laughter.]

Now, there are a great many good people residing here in the city of Washington, it is true; but we also have here quite a number of that class which looks upon the Congress, in expending money for necessary improvements outside of the city of Washington, as a Congress of "porkers"; but if the money is expended upon an improvement within the city of Washington, then it is patriotism. From their standpoint they are not capable of drawing any other line of distinction between "pork" and patriotism than the line of the boundary of the District of Columbia.

I want to say in this connection that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], is both a statesman and a patriot. He is neither sectional nor provincial in his views, but, while giving to the District that which he thinks it should receive, he also believes that the remote sections of the country—those States lying beyond the District line—should not be neglected.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is not "pork" money spent for public improvement in some other Member's district?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I judge so, sir.

We have quite a number of that class of people living here in Washington, it is true; in fact, there is another place where I presume there is quite a number of them. That other place is the place to which these same gentlemen will go when they leave the city of Washington. I thank you. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE AGRICULTURAL PROBLEM.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, we have listened this afternoon to an address by the gentleman from Maine which indicates to us, without any question what-

ever, the truth of the things that have been called to our attention by the President and by our Department of State as to the danger of the propaganda which is tending to subvert our form of government. At a time like this neither I nor you have any right to fan the fires of discontent in order to warm our own political selves; and by the same token, and for the same reason, we have no right to overlook or to be blind to conditions which at any place in our country exist and are fanning these fires of discontent.

With this thought in mind, gentlemen, I would like to present to you very briefly the condition, particularly, of the wheat farmers of the northwestern part of the United States, and in a general way of the agricultural industry of our country.

I speak particularly from the standpoint of the wheat raisers of the Northwest, because in my own State of Montana we stand second in the production of spring wheat and fifth among the States in the production of wheat of all kinds, with this last year a production of 53,000,000 bushels; and I want to call attention to the fact that 74 per cent of the spring wheat produced in Montana is No. 1 hard red wheat, of which there is no surplus in the United States but, on the other hand, rather a shortage. We must remember that there are portions of the United States just as peculiarly fitted to the raising of wheat as the South is to the production of cotton. When, therefore, we are considering as one of the correct cures of the situation the reducing of the wheat area we must remember that they can be reduced in some other places to greater advantage than they can in those sections producing practically all the hard wheat, which is necessary for the milling of the softer grades of wheat.

I want to approach this problem from the understanding, as I have said, that we have no right to fan the fires of discontent in order to warm ourselves, nor any right to refuse to see conditions which exist that have a tendency to fan those fires of discontent. The farmer, and particularly the wheat farmer, finds himself in this position: Going back to the pre-war level of purchasing values, he finds that his wheat has a purchasing value of only 79 per cent. He finds, on the other hand, that the products of the manufacturer, the man who is producing things in industry, are, under the same consideration, at 152 per cent. Then he finds that labor on the same basis, using exactly the same dates and the same considerations, has a purchasing power of 170 per cent. Why is it that agriculture stands in the general relation of 79 per cent in purchasing value for its wheat while labor stands at the ratio of 170 per cent, and those things which are produced by industry stand at the ratio of 152 per cent in purchasing value? I am not going to attack in any way the fact that labor is in that position. Labor is in that position largely because of the strict immigration laws that have been passed and in which you and I believe. We believe in restricted immigration for the purpose, first, of preserving American institutions and American ideals, as well as protecting our labor against the competition of cheap labor coming into our country from foreign shores. We must also recognize that the advantageous position of industry in this regard is to a great extent due to the protective tariff which likewise protects those things which are produced in industry against foreign competition, and we agree with that and we agree as to its soundness. But here stands agriculture in this peculiar situation, and I speak as I say particularly of the wheat growers, because I know more about them, although the things that I say will to some measure apply to those who produce any agricultural product in a surplus which must be shipped and sold into foreign markets, thereby fixing the domestic price of that product. This at the present time applies to a great extent to flour, to wheat, to cattle, to cotton, so that this is not a sectional question. This is not even a partisan question. It is a question that we should approach from the angle of trying to find out what its solution is as an American problem. We should approach it from an American angle and reach an American solution.

This agricultural problem is not, so far as we are concerned, in Russia, but there is a difficulty which we must first remove to put ourselves in the state of mind for constructive thinking. In the last few years there has grown up in a few of the States a movement made possible only because some farmers, faced with such economic inequalities as have made their lot well-nigh impossible, have grasped some proffered cures and have expressed their discontent at the polls. Immediately there has arisen against these theories an organized opposition centering its attack on doctrines termed "socialistic" and on some of the particular remedies proposed, with the result that the battle is raging between the opponents and the proponents of particular lines of thought and theories of government, leaving the issue of the unfortunate condition of agriculture and the absolute

necessity of immediate action to help the farmer place himself side by side with labor and industry, trampled under foot and overlooked in the heat of battle.

The necessity is for those of us who believe that all American problems, both foreign and domestic, can be worked out on American principles, through American thinking, and by the application of American remedies, to cease simply thinking of the fallacies in the remedies proposed, to actually do this American thinking, and to take the fundamental American action required by this problem.

I suggest that this Congress, then, made up as it is of those who represent all of the States of the American Union, try to find a solution of the problem; first, not from a Russian angle, but from an angle that will help in answering this propaganda, the danger of which the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREEDY] has so well presented to us this afternoon.

We turn from the suggestion of what should be done for agriculture to the things that have been done with regard to labor and industry, things which have properly been done, and which have afforded protection. Restricted immigration—and I hope that it will be still more restricted than it is now—has protected the laboring man, and he has been able to accomplish that because of an act of Congress. He has been benefited also by the Adamson eight-hour law, which was passed by Congress. It is true that to that he has added the advantage of his own organization and the carrying out of the things for his own benefit and interest. Now, what is it that has placed industry in its advantageous position? It is because the Congress has passed the tariff laws which protect the goods which they produce against the influx of goods produced by low-priced labor in foreign countries, and also because, through the efficiency of their own organization, they have been able to take advantage of conditions within the market.

Those are American solutions of American problems, and now we find the farmer in a disadvantageous position so far as the purchasing power of the things he produces is concerned. I said for wheat, 79 per cent; but the average of our agricultural products as a whole represents only about 75 per cent in purchasing value as compared with what it was before the war.

I am not going into any detail this afternoon in respect to the measures which we ought to consider, but I am going to ask the Members of the House to do one thing. These problems should be approached from an American angle, and the Members should study, and study carefully, the report to the President by the Secretary of Agriculture on the wheat situation, which has recently been put upon your desks. I ask you to study it sympathetically in order that you may help to arrive at a constructive solution of the difficulty.

Some proposals have been advanced. One of them is reduction of the wheat areas, and that can be brought about to a considerable extent through diversification and in other ways. I am definitely behind the movement presented to this House in the form of the Burtess bill, to help bring about that situation in the spring wheat areas of this entire country, but I also wish to say that we must not in the consideration of these fundamental measures which will in time help to solve this problem in a permanent way forget the necessity for meeting the present situation and of meeting it now.

Another idea has been advanced, and I want to give it for your consideration, and ask you to think of it deeply in connection with your study of the wheat situation as reported by the Secretary of Agriculture. That is the idea of an agricultural export corporation. Briefly, the idea is simply that there shall be created a commission, the chairman of which shall be the Secretary of Agriculture and the vice chairman of which shall be the Secretary of Commerce, with three commissioners, and that they shall be given broad powers that will enable them to take care of the surplus which is produced in wheat, in flour, in cattle, in cotton, at the present time, and such other things that may be later produced in such surplus that they go into foreign markets and have their domestic price fixed by foreign competition. It should be kept in mind that this whole theory which is being advanced is merely to stabilize these prices and not to fix them, any more than the tariff fixes the price of the thing manufactured in industry, or any more than the wages of the laboring man are fixed by our restricted immigration policy, which protects him against the influx of cheap labor into this country.

There should be carried out in this Congress a measure establishing an export corporation for the disposition of the surplus above domestic consumption. A study of world conditions indicates that next year will produce more foreign wheat than 1923, and if our domestic price is fixed by foreign markets its purchasing power will then be even lower than now. A little later the bill to create such a corporation will be introduced

and the detailed discussion incident to its full understanding will take place. Let me only ask of you now that those of you who have not come so closely face to face with this problem of the growers of wheat will meanwhile study with a sympathetic mind the report of the Secretary of Agriculture to the President on the wheat situation which has just recently come to your desks, and that you will think of constructive solutions of this national situation.

Now, gentlemen, that, in brief, without going into the details, which I would hardly wish to do until the bill which is being prepared is presented to the Congress—that in brief is the idea; and the only thing I am asking of you this afternoon is to recognize the problem from the angle of those men and women who have gone in the pioneering of these Western States and who were told by some of us who were part of the Food Administration during the war to plant every acre of wheat which was possible to plant in order that our armies might be fed.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. LEAVITT. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I wonder if the gentleman has had time or opportunity to study the Sinclair-Norris bill, which is also an export bill, but which has perhaps a larger or wider field to operate than the proposed bill of the Secretary of Agriculture, in that we may also import as well as export American products?

Mr. LEAVITT. I will say to the gentleman I have studied that only to some extent, but I believe the plan which was spoken of by the gentleman as the Wallace plan seems to be perhaps more simple and subject to less machinery that will later on have to be torn down, and may be in a better position to take care of the present situation in the fundamentals, and then give way in the natural course of events to the action of the law of supply and demand, and be thereby self-regulated as our local markets become more able to consume what is now the surplus that has caused this situation to exist.

I want to repeat in closing that the only thing I am trying to do this afternoon is to ask of the Congress that they study this problem regardless of the fact they come from other sections than those of these men who have gone into the pioneer States to make a new portion of our country. Remember, something like 150 years ago, and even at a later time, that in the old Bay State of Massachusetts it was necessary for the State legislature to pass a bonus bill to the wheat growers in order to keep them in the wheat-growing business, recognizing the necessity of producing wheat for their own consumption, and that same principle was carried on in one way or another down to 1850 and even in the days of the Civil War, and that it is not in all respects a new thing.

I will only say that, broadly, such a plan would call for a study of the relative purchasing value levels of industry, labor, and farm products, and create a market for the farm products which would only keep them on a level with the others. It would charge back against the product itself the losses due to sale of the surplus into foreign markets and would operate only while the increase in population of this country comes up to the consumption of our own products and the stabilization of general markets is taking place. It is no more price fixing than is the tariff for the manufacturer or the restricted immigration law for the laborer. It is, like both, beneficial as a protection in raising 30 per cent of our people to the same American level as the rest.

When you ask as to whether or not this plan would increase the cost of the loaf of bread, remember that the estimate is that it would not add more than one-half of a cent of the wheat cost to a loaf. Now, only about a cent and a half in the cost of an ordinary loaf of bread comes to the farmer for the production of the wheat, and remember, too, that balanced against the one-half cent increase, even if it goes on to the consumer, that 30 per cent of the population of this country—men, women, and children—are dependent upon the farming industry; that the farmers are the greatest single group of consumers of the products produced by the manufacturer; and that the farmer is the greatest single group that must be considered in a matter of this kind, because they are producing the things which are necessary for the preservation of life, and therefore for the preservation of our Union. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF NEW ORLEANS.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am somewhat diffident about attempting a speech to-day. It is the 8th day of January, however, the anniversary

of the Battle of New Orleans, and something should be said about that immortal victory, lest we forget. January 8, 1815, should be and is a great day in the history of our country, for it was upon that date on the plains of Chalmette, a little below the city of New Orleans, was fought the battle which redeemed American arms and rescued the Republic from a series of unparalleled disasters. It is a well-plowed field with me. In fact, it is like carrying snow to Lapland, or coals to Newcastle, or ice to the North Pole to recount again in this House the appreciations often expressed of the unfading glory of the Battle of New Orleans and the enduring and patriotic interest of the American people in the dramatic and thrilling chapters of that never-to-be-forgotten engagement. Reluctant would I be ordinarily to impose myself a third or fourth time upon this House upon the same subject, but the greatness of the day is my apology for singing my song once more. It is a great day in our history, for it marks a great event that had for its heroes some of the greatest men born on this continent. They are no more, but their deeds and devotion to country speak to us and our children from pages that are among the brightest in our history. New Orleans and Jackson are forever inseparably lived in the martial records and annals of the Republic.

Mr. Speaker, as a rule I am not oversentimental in respect to great names and great men. Generally I feel that they are both parts of the passing show. And yet, lest we forget, I think at times it is essential that we should solemnly devote a few moments to the magnificent figures in the history of our country, who spectacularly and magnificently, in a glorious fashion, crossed over the stage and left behind them a history that is not only illuminative but is the pride and glory of our people and stirred our children to do noble things—not dream them all day long, but to do them, and in that performance to make life, death, and that vast forever one grand, sweet song.

I know that in the passing of the years, for some reason or other, the Battle of New Orleans has been minimized in the minds of a great many people. I do not know any reason why it should not stand out in bolder relief than it has stood out for many years. Possibly no poet gifted with the divine afflatus has yet arrived to sing that victory into American hearts in a deathless way. Perhaps the historian is yet to come who will with magic pen give it a place which will cause Americans to think of it as Grecians thought of Thermopylae and Marathon. To the student of history it is clear that our brilliant success on that memorable day saved the Louisiana Purchase to this Republic, because unquestionably the purpose of England—and I say that without any feeling whatever—the purpose of England in sending Pakenham, the brother-in-law of Wellington, across the Atlantic was to take “the Crown colony,” as they called the immense tract between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains. So sure were the enemy of that day of the conquest of this territorial empire that Pakenham brought over with him a civil government who were ready to take over the reins.

To secure a proper appreciation of the battle and its consequences, its military and civil results, let us swing back the pendulum of time and turn over the pages of history. The War of 1812 was a failure up to the 8th of January, 1815. Disaster and calamity had bowed our hearts, broken our spirits, and almost prostrated the young Nation with grief, so that we sued for peace. We had sent commissioners to ask the mother country to call the war to an end. Up to New Orleans there was nothing in that terrible struggle or War of 1812 that an American would want to long remember with a great pride. Up to the inspiring day on the plains of Chalmette Americans might well feel as a result of catastrophe: “So glory’s thrill is o’er, and hearts that once beat high for praise now feel that thrill no more.” We had sent commissioners over in August, 1814.

At Ghent, in Belgium, they were met by the English commissioners, and proceeded to secure as good and satisfactory a treaty as our military failures would permit. Even while and when they were at the council table deliberating on terms of peace—terms that the English in the beginning were endeavoring to make as humiliating and degrading as possible—England was actively carrying out her plans to take over Louisiana. Six weeks after our commissioners had begun their negotiations Pakenham was sent over. The title of the United States to the Province of Louisiana had long not only been questioned but absolutely denied. Spain, the ally of England, according to English authority, had never relinquished her possession. They held that the transfer from Spain to France was a fraudulent one, and that France could not have given us a better title than she had received. The engagement on the plains of Chalmette settled definitely the matter in so far as

all of Europe was concerned, for it demonstrated that we were able to defend that vast possession militarily, with “hearts of oak and arms of steel.”

But as I said, gentlemen, it is not my purpose to discuss the great battle from the historical standpoint nor the wonderful chapters of it from the military aspect, though they ought to be the crowning glory of American history. It may not be amiss in the interest of preparedness for the future to say to you, my friends, that the school children of that gloomy period that preceded New Orleans were crying in mortification and shame and despair at the lowly position to which their country had sunk from the military standpoint. Can not you imagine with what shouts of joy they heard of the wonderful victory that restored our prestige and tingled all America with triumph? There was no telegraph in those days. I do not think steamboats were much in vogue. Railroads had not come into existence.

But there were means of conveying news, and in a relatively short time the fact that the pioneers from Kentucky and Tennessee and Upper Mississippi had gone down to the plains of Chalmette and struck a blow that raised their country's prestige almost again to the Olympian heights, changed those tears of our children into shouts of exultation and unbounded joy. The dark days were forgotten and uplifted America stood dauntlessly erect and a crest she has never lowered yet.

It is well to contemplate in the retrospect, as it were, the calamities and catastrophes and disastrous seasons that soon or late come to every nation. This contemplation should teach preparedness and that kingdoms by blood gained must by blood be maintained. The Battle of New Orleans was a great battle and had for its combatants some of the most romantic figures of that period. Over in the Congressional Library is a book entitled “Captain Sasarac.” In later years, I believe, the word “Sasarac” was better known to the people who came to New Orleans as the name of a “cocktail,” which was said to impart good cheer, friendliness, and camaraderie to those who were fortunate enough to find the fount from which it flowed. [Applause.] Possibly that good-humored illusion is all right, in view of the heated controversy here on the floor yesterday and a few days before between the champions of the wet and dry forces. Captain Sasarac, however, was the name given to Lafitte, of whom it was said he “left a corsair's name to other times, linked with one virtue and a thousand crimes.” It was a wonderful engagement, and even in this day may inspire people to believe that there is still to be found romance in some of the early achievements of our country.

There were old pirates down there on the Spanish Main before and during the War of 1812, but they were men who were not in all of their movements guided by the mere lust of gold, and who, when critical times arose, spurned the bribes offered them by the British Empire, turned their backs upon Pakenham and his glittering promises, joined General Jackson, and won for themselves an honorable place in the esteem and affection of their country. Notwithstanding the fact that they were corsairs and had been such for years before that memorable, epochal day, they rose to the heights of patriotic grandeur and glory at the clarion call of their country for men. On that field was engaged one of the most picturesque characters of the New World, Old Pushmataha. Our lamented and lately deceased friend, Ben Humphreys, of Mississippi, knew more about the history of that old Indian, I suppose, than even CHARLEY CARTER, who probably has at his finger tips the names of all the noted characters among the Choctaws and Chickasaws. To Ben and Charley Pushmataha was “Old Push.” On his deathbed he said to General Jackson, “General, let the big guns roar over me when I am gone.”

In this perhaps desultory and running way I thought we might observe the anniversary of the great battle and not retard the movement of Congress. The committees have not been able to report as yet, and we are not losing motion or time. I feel that on the 8th day of January we may speak in an affectionate way, from a nonpartisan standpoint, of the greatness of our country, its trials and defeats, as well as its wonderful growth and victories. I have always preferred to speak as an American without partisan feeling. From my viewpoint those on both sides of the aisle are not really divided; there is not much of a difference between them in their attitude upon fundamentals.

If they are divided, they are divided as the waves, but are one as the sea. So that on the 8th of January we can get together, arm in arm, shoulder to shoulder, and heel to heel, and call back memories that come like burning stars to chase the gloom away. [Applause.] That is somewhat poetical, but it is appropriate, I hope, and expresses the sentiment, partially at least, of the day.

In connection with this anniversary I have news which I know is not good tidings of a great joy. You remember a bill that I introduced and passed ordering an investigation and report on the feasibility of creating a national park on the plains of Chalmette. The War Department has reported against it, not because there is anything against it from an engineering or landscape standpoint, not that it is not feasible to create a magnificent park on the historic plains, but because the War Department found that the cost would be too great. I have no fault to find with the department for reporting adversely at this time on any proposition that might carry with it too great an expenditure, but there are some things, gentlemen, which I do not think ought to be measured too accurately by the dollar rule. There are some wonderful things in the history of our country that I do not think ought to be always scrutinized with the financial eye.

The district engineer found that it was entirely feasible to create a national park, but he estimated that the total cost would be about \$4,500,000. That does appear to be a stupendous sum to an Army engineer, in view of the cry from all over the country for a reduction of taxation and a consequent retrenchment in the expenditures of the Government.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is too much.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Probably the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is right that it is too much; but, in view of the fact that I come from a city where they do not consider as prodigal the expenditures of States, cities, and the Nation when made to consecrate holy national events, I can not be blamed if I beg to differ with the War Department. I do not think the cost would be too much to commemorate one of the most glorious engagements in the history of this country. I believe in monuments; I believe in obelisks and mausoleums—not that they can do the dead any good, but that they help commemorate great and glorious events in the history of countries and inform the young and old of the illustrious deeds of their ancestors. I believe Gray's Elegy runs something like this:

Can storied urn, or animated bust,
Back to its mansion call the fleeting breath?
Can honour's voice provoke the silent dust,
Or flattery soothe the dull cold ear of death?

That question may be answered in a higher sphere of action, to which I hope when the inevitable moment comes we shall all be translated. Gentlemen, I repeat I do not criticize the War Department for their adverse report, in view of the cry for a reduction of taxation that is ringing from one end of the country to the other, accompanied by protests even against a bonus to our soldier boys.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. What about propaganda?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I imagine there is considerable propaganda in behalf of the reduction of taxation, but, to be fair, I honestly feel there is a well-crystallized public sentiment in this country for a reduction in taxation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I ask for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR] asks for an additional five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I repeat I feel that there is a very well-defined public sentiment in this country for a reduction in public expenditures and a consequent reduction in taxation. Gentlemen, even if there was no propaganda, common sense would indicate that nobody wants to pay taxes except where it is unavoidable, particularly when attention is invited to the fact that a reduction is not only possible but entirely feasible; and once people are convinced they will go the limit in securing that reduction. I do not think there is any argument against that proposition.

But back to things that are more nearly related to my theme. And before I forget it I want to tell you a story or relate a chapter from the history of England. In my judgment it is one of the most inspiring episodes in the history of that magnificent empire, on whose dominions the sun never sets. When William the Conqueror put down forever the Saxons at the Battle of Hastings—for when Harold was blinded and could no longer lead them their defeat became a rout—the Norman King determined to substantially glorify his imperishable victory by the building of an appropriate monument. He had a battle abbey erected on that immortal battle field. His idea was to commemorate his own glory as a conqueror and the defeat of the vanquished Harold, last of

the Saxon Kings. The conqueror erected the magnificent battle abbey shortly after 1066, when the battle was fought. He intended to and did have enrolled all of the names of the soldiers that had followed him and who had won the great victory for his greater glory. But this battle abbey shows how our greatest purposes are sometimes defeated in the fullness of time. For a time or period that abbey did become almost a shrine to those who had followed the banners of William the Conqueror, but in the course of years the Norman and Saxon became one; they became the Englishman, and for generation after generation and for century after century English blood, made up of the Norman and Saxon merged, went there reverently, but not to venerate the Conqueror any more than the vanquished King Harold.

That story has caused me to think that some day, when the cry for economy is not so urgently stressed, and when we can mingle a little sentiment with practicality, some such memorial might be erected on the plains of Chalmette, if a national park is still deemed infeasible.

This is not a case of fleshpots, gentlemen, but I do not think I need assure you of that. It is not for the purpose of securing something in the nature of patronage that I am speaking, and I believe you know I am honest and sincere about that. Again I say, if a park can not be secured let me hope that a battle abbey will be erected down on the plains of Chalmette, and that in the years to come it will be a shrine to which all English-speaking people over this country might journey whenever they felt the spirit move them to go down on the Mississippi River near the Gulf of Mexico, and there look at the names of those who followed Jackson from all parts of Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Louisiana to a memorable victory; not to exult over the vanquished foe, but to reverently ponder over the thought that under certain circumstances and conditions that a land may be drenched with fraternal blood and kinsmen speaking the same tongue may fall in conflict over one another's grave. One thought must come as a result. If wars can not be prevented, we must be prepared for them. Let us hope that another thought will come to such as may make such a pilgrimage in the event of such a shrine, and that is that the New Orleans engagement was the last battle to be fought between the English-speaking people of the British Empire and of the United States of America. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana may proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit me, my mind is upon the present. The gentleman witnessed yesterday the tremendous protest and petition to Congress against waste and extravagance sent here by 300,000 farmers of America. I want to ask the gentleman, who is one of the experienced legislators here in the House, how he expects to fulfill the farmers' request made in that petition; that is, to cut down waste and extravagance in governmental expenditures and to stop the burden of undue taxation upon the people, when it is the practice here on one day to bring in appropriation bills that have been considered and drawn up by only three men and then immediately take them up for consideration and passage the next day. That is our modus operandi.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman did not yield for a speech.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is interested in what I say, because the gentleman from Louisiana comes from an agricultural country, where they raise sugar cane and cotton, and his farmers are just as much interested in a reduction of governmental expenditures as the other 300,000 farmers that signed this petition in protest of present conditions, and I will state to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] that while he might not be interested, the gentleman from Louisiana is, and I want him to tell us how we are going to do what these farmers justly ask, when the membership of the House are not given proper time to study these great appropriation measures—these great supply bills. We have to come in here blindly and pass on them and vote on them the day after they are introduced. There ought to be sufficient time for us to study them, and study them carefully.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR] has not got his \$4,000,000 yet?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I fail to see the connection. [Applause.]

I do not think it is necessary to state that each and every Member of the House of Representatives is opposed to waste and inefficiency and extravagance. I do not think the gentle-

man intended to imply that the building of the shrine I have just mentioned would be an act of waste or lacking in economy. Educational institutions are in the nature of an investment, and I believe this great Republic could safely, efficiently, economically, and to its advantage from every imaginable standpoint make this investment, which would tend to keep alive the patriotic fervor of the people of this Republic, because, in my judgment, patriotism is like all other emotions—it must be continually fanned and gently stimulated in order to be kept alive and ready for any great emergency. I once heard some one comment upon the patriotism of the United States in a sort of a philosophical and analytical manner. He is a good American at that. He stated that we had to build up our patriotic fervor and the exaltation which we reached during the war almost brick by brick. In the beginning it had to be stimulated; afterwards it moved with its own motion. Its activities and its fire and its enthusiasm had to be gradually fanned up before we were able to accomplish the wonderful things we did accomplish.

Gentlemen, in all probability my time is about at an end so far as this feeble attempt at a speech is concerned. I believe it is in the closing lines of Childre Harold that Byron says, as well as I can recall the lines:

My song has ceased,
My theme is ended;
Would it were worthier.

I did not prepare any address for the occasion. After all such addresses are neither more nor less than high-sounding, platitudinous sentences arranged in a glittering way for the purpose of securing the literary approval of those to whom they are addressed. I believe in a heart-to-heart sort of talk like this, in which I hope I have evidenced in a small way that I am not lacking in sentiment with respect to one of the great engagements of this country, and that I have given you a fair idea of what I think the people want in the way of a reduction of taxation and retrenchment in expenditures, and that I will abide by what I know will be the patriotic judgment of the American people, to in due time construct this shrine which will glorify the annals of English history both on this and the other side of the Atlantic Ocean. [Applause.]

For the information of the many who are at the present and may be in the future interested in the report of the War Department, I will say it may be found in the archives of the Committee on Military Affairs. Under the privilege granted me to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to print the letter from the district engineer which sets forth substantially the reasons for the adverse report:

UNITED STATES ENGINEERS OFFICE,
New Orleans, La., July 13, 1923.

To the CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,

United States Army, Washington, D. C.

(Through the Division Engineer, Gulf Division.)

1. A survey has been made of the site suggested from the Chalmette Monument property downstream to the Paris Road and from the Mississippi River back to the 40-arpent line, and map of same in five sheets has been prepared, tracings of which are transmitted herewith.

2. A public highway and the tracks of the Louisiana Southern Railroad, running roughly east and west, separate the site into what may be described as the southern and the northern sections.

3. The land in the southern section, comprising about 630 acres, is owned mostly by the New Orleans Terminal Co., a subsidiary of the Southern Railway Co., although about 26 acres were sold to the Chalmette Oil Refining Co. at the rate of about \$3,850 per acre, and there is a settlement called Fazendeville which is owned in small lots by numerous parties.

4. The New Orleans Terminal Co., through their agents, have failed to set a price on this property, stating that it is not for sale, as the company bought it for their own use and need it. It is extremely unlikely that the Chalmette Oil Refining Co. would be willing to sell at any reasonable price. The many owners of the town lots would be unwilling to part with their homes unless forced to. The only way in which these tracts could be obtained would be by condemnation proceedings, and it is probable that under such procedure the value of the land would be set at not less than an average of \$5,000 per acre at the present time and at a still higher rate in the future.

5. The land in the northern section comprises about 975 acres. The major portion of this is owned by the New Orleans Terminal Co., the balance consisting of small farms and a residence subdivision. The agents for terminal company state that they can not quote a price on the entire tract, but that they would be willing to consider \$550 per acre for the portions that are still for sale. It is probable that the smaller owners and the subdivision owners would ask a much higher price and one that would make the average price for the whole tract about \$600 per acre.

6. The estimated cost of this park is as follows, nothing having been included for the beautification of the grounds by planting grass, shrubby trees, etc.:

Purchase of southern portion, 630 acres at \$5,000-----	\$3,150,000
Purchase of northern portion, 975 acres at \$600-----	585,000
Total for purchase of land-----	3,735,000
Roads in southern portion, say 5 miles-----	150,000
Fencing, clearing, draining, etc., in southern portion-----	25,000
Roads in northern portion, say 8 miles-----	240,000
Fencing, clearing, draining, levee building in northern portion-----	100,000
Total-----	4,250,000

7. As noted in paragraph 6 of my first indorsement, quoting paragraph 16 of report of my predecessor, it was by him deemed desirable to purchase the property between Chalmette Monument property and the National Cemetery, so as to make one undivided unit. There appears now to be no possibility of obtaining the tracts estimated upon above, nor of obtaining the southern portion only, except at much greater cost than was believed at that time.

8. The act of Congress directed that investigation be made as to the "feasibility of establishing" this proposed national military park; in accordance with this language I report that, in my opinion, it is not feasible to establish a military park on the plains of Chalmette by reason of the excessive cost.

E. J. DENT, District Engineer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. By order of the House the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, may I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD] begins, the gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. KNUTSON. Reserving the right to object, they will be his own remarks, I take it. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FARMERS' PETITION REGARDING GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, yesterday 345,516 actual and real farmers filed a petition with this Congress asking for relief from the conditions that in my opinion have been permitted to exist during this entire national administration. Their spokesman stated that these petitions had been in course of preparation for 14 months. I remember that they spoke in no unmeasured terms at the polls in 1922—this being evidenced by the great reduction of the Republican majority in Congress. That the farmer is and has been entitled to relief has long been recognized by everyone except a few stand-pat Republicans, who during all these 14 months and since the beginning of the Sixty-sixth Congress have dominated and ruled Congress with an iron hand.

The farmer is entitled to all the relief he asks, but I fear he is doomed to disappointment and that some of the policies he is being "propaganded" into believing will be of aid to him will be as disastrous to him as have been the stand-pat Republican policies of the past four years.

However, he is entitled to a sympathetic ear, he has a complaint coming, for since the relinquishment of Democratic control of the Government he has seen his fortunes disappear and prices of the things he produces go to the lowest level. That the failure of the Republicans in this matter has been pitiful is fully proved by the record. Yet they have continually boasted of what they were going to do. First they destroyed his world market through their foreign policies; then they undertook to increase his prosperity by placing upon his shoulders exorbitant freight rates, and as a last resort they dragged forth the old timeworn protective tariff idea and burdened him with higher prices for practically everything he uses on the farm for the benefit of their white-whiskered infant industries; but all this time the farmer suffered. None of these Republican remedies were beneficial, but were detrimental to him. Then, as a last resort, one of the numerous useless commissions was called into consultation. With a blare of trumpets and first-page headlines they went forth to immediately cure all the farmers' ills, and finally, after a swing around the circle which was no doubt much enjoyed, they reported to the President, and the farmer still suffers. This report is, I understand, very interesting and instructive and should be read by every farmer and Member of Congress. That it is interesting and instructive

is heralded by the Tulsa Daily World, of Tulsa, Okla., one of the leading Republican newspapers of the country, which in an editorial in its issue of November 7, 1923, commented on the commission's report as follows:

AN OFFICIAL REPORT.

We have before us a "report to the President on the wheat situation," by Eugene Meyer, jr., and Frank W. Mondell, two Government officials. It is remarkable for its lucidity and exactness, and the fund of information these investigators gleaned. The gist of the report is found in the opening paragraph. Here it is stated that in Chicago, Minneapolis, Sioux Falls, Fargo, Billings, Helena, Spokane, Portland, Pocatello, and Denver they found winter wheat looking fine, while at San Francisco, Salt Lake, and Cheyenne livestock appeared to be in a healthy state, and the situation furnished them an interesting study.

The report is very assuring. We had feared the wheat in the cities named was suffering from either the extended wet spell or the eighteenth amendment, and that foot disease had broken out in the stock ranches in San Francisco and Salt Lake City.

This report will be of inestimable value to the industries in the cities visited by the investigators.

Since the report above referred to was made Congress has assembled, a message has been received from the President, and neither by any action of Congress or suggestion of the President has any definite program of relief been brought forth or suggested, the Congress having been satisfied to waste practically six weeks while the President was content to tell the farmer that he is "a public necessity," that the acreage of wheat is too large, and that he must quit raising it for export. In other words, he must abandon part of his land while high freight rates and the exorbitant tariff rates of the McCumber-Fordney tariff law consume his equity in his land, through high prices, he must pay for all things he buys. But perhaps there may be yet a ray of hope for him, for the administration yet has Mondell and Meyer ready always for a trip, and no doubt that several times between now and the next election they and others will make enlightening and encouraging reports and hold out false hopes in order that the farmer may again be persuaded that he should be satisfied with the "change" he got in 1920.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' LEGISLATION.

Mr. JEFFERS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, as an introductory paragraph to what I desire to say, I wish to quote a very apt paragraph from this morning's Washington Post:

Five weeks after it convenes the House passes its first general bill—an act recodifying the Federal Statutes, which has been hanging fire for more than a year. What's the mad rush, boys?

Now, gentlemen, with reference to the slogan—"Everything for the disabled"—about which we are hearing so much and reading so much nowadays in connection with the agitation regarding the matter of tax reduction and regarding the matter of adjusted compensation for the ex-service people of the Nation, I beg leave to call attention to a condition which exists here to-day.

A great many Members of the House have placed themselves on record as being in favor of priority for the disabled, and that would mean that they are in favor of having the way cleared for the really prompt consideration of, and suitable action upon, legislation which might be proposed in the interest of any or all of the disabled service people of the Nation. Now, it has been proposed that there be a new committee created in the House for the purpose of handling soldier legislation. The various organizations of ex-service people in the country have gone on record in favor of the creation of such a new committee, and they have vigorously and earnestly urged and requested it. Several different resolutions have been introduced here in the House from time to time providing for such a new committee.

When the present Congress was about to get under way the caucus of the Democratic Members took the lead in promptly going on record as being in favor of the creation of this new committee. The Republican caucus also went on record as in favor of it. As I say, Members on both sides of the aisle have given their promise that they would work for priority for the disabled in preference to everything else which they might have before them. Congress convened early in December and ran along for two weeks before quitting for the Christmas holidays. Yet, even though many Members of the House had given their word that they would strive for priority for the disabled in preference to everything else, and even though the party caucus of the party in power—the Republican Party—had, following the action taken by the Democratic caucus, gone on

record as being in favor of the creation of the new committee, nothing at all was done here in Congress toward actually creating this new committee during those two weeks before the Christmas holidays, so that it could actually get down to business on anything that it might find before it in the way of legislation for the relief of the disabled or legislation in any way affecting ex-service people. So, therefore, consideration of and action upon any legislation of that nature has thus far been completely blocked.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFERS. I do not think that I have time to finish what I have to say, and so I must decline to yield at this time; I am sorry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. JEFFERS. It looks like those who are in charge of the program in the House intend to carry out the idea of "priority for the disabled" when they get around to it, whenever that may be, even though so many Members have declared their intention to work for priority for the disabled above all else.

Now, any legislation affecting our ex-service people which may be pending at this time is simply "hanging fire," absolutely nothing being done on it. On account of this agitation and all the talk which has been indulged in regarding the forming of this new committee, and since both party caucuses have gone on record as being in favor of the creation of this new committee it is but natural to expect that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is not going to take up business of this nature for consideration, because from all that has been said and promised the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would have every reason to believe that a new committee is going to be formed and naturally they are not going to take up business of this nature, expecting that business of this nature will be taken from them and transferred to the new committee when this new committee is formed. So, I say, every day's delay about the formation of the new committee is simply a day of putting off the consideration of legislation affecting the ex-service people and another day of defeating the idea of "priority for the disabled."

The lack of a committee devoted to handling legislation affecting veterans was never more fatal to progress in such matters than at this time. If the idea of priority for the disabled had been carried out conscientiously the formation of this new committee would have been one of the very first acts of this Congress, following the action taken in caucus when it was agreed that such a new committee should be formed. This amounts to a needless and indefensible delay regarding the vital matter of legislation affecting the disabled, on which priority has been promised, as well as corresponding delay on all matters concerning or affecting war veterans.

The responsibility for this delay is clearly upon the leaders who control the plans and action of the administration forces at the present time. I do not know why the new committee was not established a month ago, as apparently there is no controversy about it and apparently all sides are for it. That is what I would like to know from those who are in control here in the House of Representatives at this time.

It may be that the leaders of the party in power consider that it is political strategy to wait until after January 14, which is the date set for the Republican regulars to do battle with the Republican insurgents over the rules question. But I do not believe the ex-service people of the Nation, especially the disabled ex-service people, will agree with you or grant you that this delay on this proposition, which affects the welfare and even affects the health and actually affects the lives of some of the disabled war veterans, is justifiable on the grounds of political expediency or party strategy.

Contained in communications which have been received and which are in opposition to adjusted compensation for ex-service people we find the stereotyped appeal for everything for the disabled; we hear from the President of the United States that he wishes legislation for the disabled to be expedited; but we have been here over a month now and the new committee, which has been proposed and promised, has not yet even been created, so that it could get right down to business. It can not be denied that this constitutes indefensible delay. As I have said, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce refrains from beginning the consideration of legislation of this character because of the promise that a new committee on veterans' affairs would be created. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can not be blamed for that. Under the circumstances it is but natural that they should look at the matter in that light, and then, too, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has its hands full anyway with other matters coming regularly under its jurisdiction.

The responsibility lies at the door of the leaders of the party in power.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFERS. No; I have only a minute more.

Mr. SNYDER. But I just want to ask a question.

Mr. JEFFERS. If I have time when I finish what I have to say, I shall then be very glad to yield. They could have had this committee created a month ago, if they had wanted to. It was not done. It is to be hoped that this delay will not be allowed to continue any longer. Political expediency is understood under some circumstances and in connection with some things, but it ought to be considered as out of the bounds of politics and beyond the pale of decency for a matter of this kind affecting the welfare and the health and even the very lives of our veterans to be played with as politics by those who are in positions of authority. I want to express the hope that something will be done without further delay.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Alabama be extended for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Alabama be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question at this point?

Mr. JEFFERS. I yield first to the gentleman from New York and then I shall yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to ask the gentleman if he was certain which party in the House was ruling legislation?

Mr. JEFFERS. Oh, of course, if the party on that side wants to pass the buck, they can start passing the buck.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JEFFERS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. We all know that they are incapable of ruling, but is it not a fact that the Rules Committee this afternoon could bring in a resolution here creating a committee, and that it could make a special order here under a special rule and pass it in 15 minutes?

Mr. JEFFERS. Yes; and they could have done it the day the House was organized.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, at various times we have had men make statements upon the floor of the House and in the press of the country and I doubt not from the platform advocating that Congress by legislation do something for a certain group or class of individuals which that class or group ought to be doing for themselves. I call the attention of the House to this fact. I do not believe that it is the light demagogic opportunity that it appears to be in effect, but I believe that the price to be paid ultimately by insincerity of men in high places, advocating something that they know never can be done, is just as dangerous as some other kinds of advocacy which has been practiced in the past. I call the attention of Members as legislators to a fact and not a theory, that in every country in the world, regardless of the kind of government, during the war the individual citizen under that government surrendered to his government the right to do his own thinking and to arrive at his own judgment. That we in America surrendered to our Government during the war is proven almost without saying. The great mass of people ate brown bread if they were asked to do so by their Government and never made complaint, and we used only one lump of sugar if we were permitted to do so, or not any, if the Government so requested, and we never found fault.

If I happened to have a piece of machinery in my factory and the Government needed it in some other city and the Government came after it, I never considered objecting. The bright page in American history seems to me to be the fact that when the Government claimed the most cherished article in the home, namely, the son, all it had to do was to reach out its long arm, tap him on the shoulder, and say, "We need you somewhere else." That appears to prove conclusively to me that the individual citizen under the Government surrenders to his Government the right to guide and determine his own destiny during war time. Now, the saddest thing to my mind is that when the reconstruction period comes after the war the hardest

thing is to get the individual citizen again to accept that responsibility for his own welfare, and as a result of that reluctance people are now demanding that we legislate relief for them. The mass mind of a country, which is nothing more than a conglomerate of the individual mind, is turning to Washington by petition and protest and asking us to do by legislation that which they ought to do for themselves. [Applause.]

I will go further and I will say to you my colleagues on this side of the House, as well as on my own side, that the less attempt we make to legislate to solve these social and economic problems which belong to the individual and the community the better Government we will have in 1935 or 1950. The gentleman from Nebraska perhaps thought he was making a good speech for publication out through his district, and seemed perfectly willing for self-aggrandizement to stimulate a little more the discontent that exists among the farmers and blame it on the Republican Party. My friend, I take the responsibility out in my country—

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. The gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. BEGG. I said the gentleman from Nebraska when I meant the gentleman from Oklahoma. I will accept the responsibility for the condition of the farmer or the laborer or the manufacturer or the business man in Ohio. The biggest thing they want is not for somebody to legislate money out of the Treasury and give it to them but they want us to legislate in such a way that they will be granted an opportunity to make a living instead of being given a free ticket for meals. The gentleman from Oklahoma said a moment ago in his speech that the Republican Party had not and was not giving any relief to the farmer and the American people in all our administration. Why, I will take the Democratic press of the country and prove the falsity of the statement. When the Republican Party came into power a little over two years ago every metropolitan press, every village press, in the whole country carried in streaming headlines the fact that there were 4,000,000 men walking the streets hunting work. To-day the metropolitan press of both political parties, the little urban press, everyone, send the New Year's greeting to the American people that the outlook for 1924 is the best in the history of the country for financial prosperity for the whole people. [Applause.]

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I can not yield at this time. Now, in that I agree. But for the sake of the masses of the people outside who do not know how much insincerity there is in some speeches, let us begin to tell the truth. If, as you say, the Republican Party is responsible for the fact that wheat is 99 cents a bushel or more on the American side and 75 on the Canadian side, my friend, Mr. HOWARD, if he wants to be fair, ought to tell his people that that is because the Republican Party gave a tariff on wheat and the Canadian import was shut out. [Applause.] But for the past 10 years there has never been a Democratic tariff in existence for one hour when the wheat on the Canadian side was not as high, or from 5 to 7 cents higher, than in Minneapolis or Chicago. My friend, there has never been a time when there was a Republican tariff in existence that the price of wheat in Milwaukee was not 15 to 30 cents higher than in Montreal, Ottawa, and the other wheat centers of Canada. Why do you not tell the farmers that the Republican tariff puts into the pockets of the farmers about \$215,000,000 annually on wheat alone over what the Democratic or Underwood tariff put in. These figures are based on an average sale of five years.

Of course, it does not take a wise man to know that a tariff will not protect against overproduction, crop failure, and so forth. To hear the Democratic orators talk, you would think the tariff responsible for them, however.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I can not yield at this time. If you want to be fair in making a speech to send out to your communities and charge the Republican Party with any little defects there may be in any particular section of the country, you should also tell them that under the Democratic tariff two years after the war was over, when Mr. Wilson had control of the Government, the price of wool dropped to 11 cents, and that after the Republican Party got into control and put a tariff on wool it rose in price to 30, 50, and 60 cents a pound. This bosh about the tariff being a drawback to the American farmer to-day—there is nothing to it. The American tariff is a godsend to the American farmer to-day, because the price wheat brings is 25 to 35 cents more than in any other market in the world. The price of wool is from 15 to 25 cents higher; but every other agricultural product the farmer has to buy in the way of machinery, and so forth, if I am not misquoting, and I am not inten-

tionally—every single machine the farmer uses has been placed on the free list. Now, if free trade is a panacea for all the ills of the farmer, why does not the price of his machinery come down? Now, then, if you and politicians want to be fair, if you agree with me that the mass mind of the country ought to be kept satisfied, then tell the whole story or do not tell anything of it. Do not take the petition of the 250,000 and say, "Of course, they have not had relief." When we took the reins of power the country was in a stagnated condition, with 4,000,000 idle men, and now, in three years, every man in America is tied to a job and to-day the American laboring man is receiving the best wage he ever received in his history and every class of people in this country enjoys a prosperity unknown in any other country. There is more money spent for recreation and pleasure in the United States than is spent for the necessities of life in any other nation of the world. There is the best condition in the great American family, whether it is on the farm or in the city, that any country in the world ever knew, and that condition will continue so long as the economic policy of the Republican Party prevails.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BEGG. I regret that I can not yield to the gentleman at this time. I will ask for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. I wish the gentleman would answer me one question.

Mr. BEGG. I will answer you.

Mr. STEVENSON. How happens it that last year, when the business was so fine, as you describe, there were 543 bank failures, a larger number than in any year before?

Mr. BEGG. That was due to the faulty economic administration of the Democratic Party of the war period. It inaugurated sudden deflation, and just as soon as deflation began to take place they could not meet their obligations. Down in the gentleman's own country, in the State of South Carolina, was one of the worst places in the United States.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. BEGG. I will not yield any more.

Mr. STEVENSON. I thought the gentleman would not let me make a rejoinder.

Mr. BEGG. Go ahead.

Mr. STEVENSON. If that is the condition down in South Carolina, how does it happen that in the territory west of the Mississippi and north of the Oklahoma line and east of Washington State 435 of the 543 banks failed, out in the Republican country? [Applause.]

Mr. BEGG. That is easy to answer; the easiest in the world. There never was a bigger fallacy economically—nobody ever accused a Democrat of being an economist—there never was a bigger economic fallacy foisted upon any people than the Government's policy during the war of cost-plus for manufacturing. [Applause.] And the Government, I will say to the gentleman from South Carolina, is the biggest criminal of them all. You went into the community, you, the Government, and said to the contractor, "Go out and get the labor, bid the price of peace-time industry up," and through those false economics you pyramided and inflated the dollar to the point where it had to come down. It is the result of the mistakes of your own party, and you know it as well as anybody else.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I can not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman from Oklahoma, my good friend HOWARD, said one of the reasons why the farmers were in bad condition was because of the exorbitant freight rates. God knows the freight rates are high enough, but why are they high? They are high because the Democratic administration operated the railroads and made direct gifts to the men working on the railroads without their asking it; and Mr. McAdoo, the man you may have to swallow as your standard bearer this time, is the very man who called them in and said, "Go back home and organize your men and come down and I will raise your wages."

Now, I want to ask you, who are trying to be fair, why do not you tell the people in Oklahoma, who are growing corn and cotton, that the freight rates can not be cut when the cost of operation is as high as it is, and if the cost of operation is cut then the wages of the laborers on the railroads have got to be

cut; and I want to know how many on the Democratic side of the House have the moral courage to stand up and say, "I will cut the wages of the railroad men."

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I would not cut them.

Mr. BEGG. Neither would I. I would rather pay them high wages and have all shippers pay a high enough freight rate to enable the railroad employees to receive decent wages.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Why do not you also tell the farmer that the greatest raise in rates made by the railroads has been made on the recommendation of the Railroad Board during this administration?

Mr. BEGG. I can not dispute that, because I have not looked it up.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is not true. Deny it categorically.

Mr. BEGG. Now, a great deal of capital has been made out of the fact that this Congress has done nothing. I will put the record of this Congress up against the record of any Congress. [Laughter.] Gentlemen, you may laugh. I will put this Congress down to date, in actual work, alongside of any session of Congress, the first session of a Congress, including a Democratic Congress, for constructive effort for the benefit of the country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask for one minute more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEGG. I want to say only one word more. My good friend from Alabama [Mr. JEFFERS] says that of course the committee on soldiers could be created in a day. Surely it could. Then he went on to make a speech about the relief of disabled soldiers. There is not a man in the House who will not fight at any time for the relief of the disabled soldier if a disabled soldier needs it, but to my knowledge there is not a disabled soldier who is suffering because of a failure on the part of the legislative body to prescribe a remedy. Now, the gentleman from Alabama has been very busy around this House trying, as best he can, to get rid of certain legislation and get some legislation in favor of the able-bodied soldiers.

Mr. JEFFERS. What does the gentleman have reference to?

Mr. BEGG. I refer to the proposed adjusted compensation act.

Mr. JEFFERS. What do you refer to when you say I have been trying to sidetrack something?

Mr. BEGG. I say it from the knowledge of the company the gentleman keeps.

Mr. JEFFERS. You have no right to make that statement.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. JEFFERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may have two minutes more.

Mr. KNUTSON. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I have always listened with interest to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG]. He has said something about "mass psychology." I have been able to study "mass psychology" more since I have known him than ever before. He can meet himself coming back oftener in a 10-minute speech than any man in this House. I intend that as a compliment, not to the strength of his intellect, but to his gymnastic ability.

He started, with evident irritation, at the expression of disappointment and irritation on the part of the American people that the Republicans had not redeemed their campaign pledges, numerous as they were in 1920, by saying, "They have no business coming here and asking us to redeem our pledges"—not in so many words, but the real meaning back of his speech was: "Why do you not go back home and tell the folks to shut their mouths, keep quiet, and quit coming to Congress and asking for something?" Was not that his theory? He started out by denouncing blocs, and then what did he do? When he found himself in a tight place he commenced pleading for that old, old theory, not that of economic independence and not that of freedom from paternalistic aid by the Government, which he had just announced as his pet theory, but, just like the "dog that returns to his vomit," being a Republican, he came back to the old paternalistic doctrine that American business and American

enterprise is so weak that it will wither and perish unless the paternalistic arm of the Government reaches out into the pockets of the consumers of the Nation and taxes everybody in the guise of a tariff tax, American business and American enterprise not being able to stand alone.

Now, if the gentleman wants to stand on the old Democratic doctrine, that the people are best governed who are least governed, and that it is not right to tax all the people for the benefit of a special few, then let him stand on it and let him vote that way. Of course, it is difficult for him to preach that old Democratic doctrine, but when he makes the effort he should not at the same time contradict himself by renewing his allegiance to the special privilege theory of the protective tariff. Oh, if we are so prosperous; if American business has the genius and enterprise the gentleman says it has, then why is it necessary to maintain a tariff law that taxes the American people greater than any tax that was ever levied upon a people by a free government since the dawn of civilization? [Applause.]

Talk about reducing the cost of living. The gentleman, in his own argument, admitted and confessed that a tariff tax enters into the cost of living, because you say to the man who manufactures the things which are protected by a tariff tax, "We do it for the purpose of enabling you to get a higher price for your products." Why, gentlemen, the \$4,000,000,000 toll that is represented by the present tariff tax is a greater factor in the high cost of living to-day than all the other tax burdens the American people bear. If you Republicans are sincere and not playing bunk politics and really want to reduce taxation, you should include a cut in the monopolistic tariff tax which now burdens the consumers of the Nation.

In 1920 you said, "Oh, if you will just put us in, we will reduce the high cost of living." You said to the wheat growers of the West, "The Democratic administration held you down to \$2.26 for your wheat during the necessities of the war, when, as a matter of fact, if you had not been put under restraint you would have gotten \$5 for your wheat." You promised them that if they would put the Republicans in power you would pass a law which would recoup their losses. At least one Republican in my presence made a speech on the stump in a Western State in which he said, "Just put us in power, and we will pass a bill which will recoup you for your losses under the Democratic administration by voting you the difference. But instead of that what have you done? You have not done that, and you did not intend to do it; you were simply making bogus promises. What you did was to put into effect a tax system under which the great industrial centers of this Nation are uncertainly prosperous at this hour, but agriculture languishes and the wheat farmers of the West can not get the cost of production for their products. Yet you led the wheat grower to believe that it was a curse to have a Democratic administration under which he could get \$2.26 for his wheat, and you say to him to-day he ought to be thankful because he lives under the beneficence and great prosperity of Republican administration which has brought him 90-cent wheat, while the consumer still pays war prices for bread." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WINGO. I do not understand the philosophy of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BELL, for 10 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. CUMMINS, for five days on account of death in his family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 9, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

263. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a schedule of papers and documents which are not needed in the transaction of public business and which have no permanent value or historical interest; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

264. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to transfer to the Department of Commerce a portion of Ship Island, for use as a lighthouse reservation,

and the remaining part of the island to the Treasury Department for quarantine purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

265. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report on preliminary examination of Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla., and entrance thereto through East Pass; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

266. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers reports on preliminary examination of Lake Fausse Pointe, with a view to securing a navigable channel by constructing and maintaining a canal from Grand Bayou to Sandy Point, or otherwise; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

267. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for payment of claims for damages to and loss of private property incident to the "training, practice, operation, or maintenance of the Army," aggregating the sum of \$73,812.86; to the Committee on Claims.

268. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting claims, in the sum of \$612.85, which have been adjusted and which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 151); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 1362) granting an increase of pension to Harriet M. Miller; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1775) granting a pension to Joseph Bauer; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1986) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Grady; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 2010) granting a pension to Mary A. Blair; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 2953) granting a pension to Martha Eberlein; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 4364) granting an increase of pension to Alma C. Walker; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 4680) granting a pension to Alice Maud Gay; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 4971) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4972) to authorize reservation of mineral rights in lands exchanged in the Manti National Forest, Utah; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 4973) to appropriate for the repair, maintenance, and care of the roadway through the national soldiers' cemetery at Fort Scott, Kans., and 1 mile of the old Government roadway into Fort Scott, and to relieve Fort Scott of the repair, maintenance, and care of the said old Government roadway; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MCCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 4974) to transfer calcium arsenate from the dutiable to the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4975) directing the method in which claims shall be paid by disbursing officers of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4976) to construct, maintain, and operate bridges across the Fox River at the city of Aurora, Kane County, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPROUL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4977) to adjust the compensation of rural mail carriers and maintenance allowance for their equipment; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 4978) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 4979) providing for the development of the water power of the Potomac River at and near the Great Falls; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 4980) authorizing entry as revocable town sites by occupants on, and providing for annual rental of, public leased lands in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 4981) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permission to the city of Philadelphia, Pa., to widen Haines Street in front of the national cemetery, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 4982) granting the consent of Congress to the construction of a highway bridge over the Hudson River at Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 4983) providing for hospitalization, medical treatment, nursing, and all necessary care of disabled ex-service men; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DRIVER: A bill (H. R. 4984) to authorize the Clay County bridge district, in the State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge over Current River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4985) to repeal the first proviso of section 4 of an act to establish a national park in the Territory of Hawaii, approved August 1, 1916; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 4986) to make a survey of the Saratoga battle field and to provide for the compilation and preservation of data showing the various positions and movements of troops at that battle, illustrated by diagrams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 4987) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Lewistown, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: A bill (H. R. 4988) providing for the erection of a public building at Springvalley, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STENGLE: Resolution (H. Res. 137) to investigate wide differences between what producers receive and consumers pay for farm products; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUTLER: Resolution (H. Res. 138) authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs to sit during sessions and recesses of the Sixty-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FISH: Resolution (H. Res. 139) favoring the calling by the President of an international conference at Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, favoring such legislation as will insure the prohibition and curtailment of the use of tax-free securities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, favoring legislation that will prohibit the issuance of tax-exempt securities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 4989) granting an increase of pension to Sophia P. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4990) granting an increase of pension to John Edward Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 4991) granting a pension to George Oscar Flowers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 4992) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Akers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 4993) for the relief of Theophilus Lacy Keen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY: A bill (H. R. 4994) to award a medal of honor to Ivory H. Pike; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4995) granting a pension to Ella S. Robison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4996) granting a pension to Mary A. Gurney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 4997) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the George F. Root Post, No. 181, American Legion Auxiliary, North Reading, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CORNING: A bill (H. R. 4998) for the relief of the State of New York; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRIVER: A bill (H. R. 4999) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Stubbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 5000) granting a pension to Emma Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 5001) granting an increase of pension to William F. Schmadeka; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5002) granting a pension to Dudley C. Tribble; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5003) granting a pension to Otis A. Turnbow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5004) granting a pension to Emmett A. La Dow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5005) granting a pension to Wilbur F. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5006) granting a pension to Albert M. Duffield; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5007) granting a pension to Alice A. Bell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5008) granting a pension to George D. Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5009) granting a pension to Aaron F. Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5010) granting a pension to Ida J. Hitt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5011) granting a pension to George Dickerson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5012) granting a pension to Barbara Oglesby; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5013) granting a pension to John L. Jeffries; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5014) granting a pension to Ebbie Allstott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 5015) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Borough of the Bronx, State of New York, two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 5016) granting a pension to Samuel D. Glenn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5017) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5018) granting an increase of pension to Emma Park; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5019) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Stormes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5020) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Tharpe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5021) granting a pension to Mary Cole Leach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5022) granting a pension to John E. T. Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5023) granting a pension to Eliza Forbes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5024) granting a pension to Kate Farmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5025) granting an increase of pension to Wedding Colgate; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5026) granting an increase of pension to Ruth E. Strickler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5027) granting a pension to Atwood P. Latham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5028) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Kroush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 5029) granting an increase of pension to Amelia S. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5030) granting a pension to Mary Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5031) for the relief of William Eller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5032) granting a pension to J. E. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLS: A bill (H. R. 5033) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Elizabeth B. Eddy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 5034) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Catherine Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5035) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Dowling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5036) granting a pension to Catharine A. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5037) granting an increase of pension to Walter S. Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5038) granting a pension to Lillie Beam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5039) granting a pension to Amanda Wishard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5040) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Stetson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5041) granting a pension to Alice Beam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5042) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Fletcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5043) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Eddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5044) granting a pension to Lilly Albaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5045) granting a pension to Hannah Wetherell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 5046) granting a pension to Francis H. P. Showalter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5047) granting a pension to Rachel A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 5048) granting a pension to Anna E. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: A bill (H. R. 5049) to renew and extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PAIGE: A bill (H. R. 5050) granting an increase of pension to William T. McGuinness; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 5051) granting a pension to Alice McOmber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 5052) granting an increase of pension to Isabel Shurr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 5053) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Richland, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5054) granting an increase of pension to William A. Holmes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5055) granting a pension to Nancy Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 5056) granting a pension to Emily H. Read; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWOOPE: A bill (H. R. 5057) granting an increase of pension to Therza J. Blair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5058) granting an increase of pension to John McGuire; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 5059) granting a pension to David C. Woodring; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5060) granting a pension to Sallie E. Luke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5061) for the relief of Russell Wilmer Johnson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5062) granting a pension to James Thomas Elmore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5063) granting an increase of pension to Oren F. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5064) authorizing the President to reappoint Maj. Harry Walter Stephenson, United States Army, retired, to the position and rank of major, Coast Artillery Corps, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5065) making appropriation for payment of claims of John Sevier, sr., and John Sevier, jr., in accordance with report and findings of the Court of Claims as reported in House Documents Nos. 1302 and 131, under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, known as the Bowman Act; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5066) granting a pension to Martin T. Atkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5067) granting a pension to Elizabeth Guy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 5068) granting an increase of pension to Floyd J. Gaines; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5069) granting a pension to Cynthia M. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5070) to correct the military record of Andrew J. Wilhoit; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5071) granting a pension to Mary J. Quattlebaum; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5072) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Walters; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5073) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5074) granting a pension to Nancy E. Huff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARD of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 5075) to provide for an examination and survey of a channel connecting the harbor at Manteo, N. C., with the Norfolk-Beaufort Inland Waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 5076) granting an increase of pension to David F. Mansfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5077) granting a pension to Sanford Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

431. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of officers and employees of Titus Blatter & Co., 162 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., favoring Mellon tax-reduction plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

432. By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of J. A. Lovett, M. D., and other citizens of Liberty, Tex., urging support of Sterling-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

433. By Mr. BURTNESS: Petition of residents of McKenzie County, N. Dak., requesting Congress to take immediate action to stabilize the price of wheat in Minneapolis and Duluth, Minn., fixing the price at \$2 per bushel for No. 1 northern grade; to the Committee on Agriculture.

434. By Mr. BURTON: Petition of employees of the Ideal Paper Box Co., Cleveland, Ohio, favoring a reduction in Federal income taxes as proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury in his letter of November 10, 1923, to Hon. WILLIAM R. GREEN, chairman Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

435. Also, petition of divers veterans of the World War, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the tax-reduction plan as recommended by Secretary Mellon and opposing a bonus for former service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

436. Also, petition of the Cuyahoga County Council of the American Legion, Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the passage of the adjusted compensation bill sponsored by the American Legion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

437. Also, petition of members and employees of the Osborn Engineering Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, opposing any legislation for a bonus to the returned soldiers unless some greatly different plan than any thus far proposed can be evolved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

438. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of members of the General Joseph P. Sanger Camp, No. 15, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Massachusetts, approving the Executive order of the late President Harding; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

439. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of United States Blind Veterans of the World War, urging immediate and substantial provision for the compensation of the men who served in the World War and who suffered total or partial blindness during or subsequent to the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

440. Also, petition of the New York State Fish, Game, and Forest League, indorsing the Federal game refuge public shooting grounds bill, which, although it passed the United States Senate, was defeated by a small margin in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

441. Also, petition of Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, requesting the Members of Congress to promptly revise upward the scale of pay for postal workers to such an extent as will afford them not only a decent living wage but will also prove attractive to desirable candidates for this important public service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

442. Also, petition of board of supervisors of the county of Essex, favoring the erection of the proposed bridge across the narrows of Lake Champlain, between Crown Point, in the State of New York, and Chimney Point, in the State of Vermont, as

being in the interest of the people of both of such States by facilitating traffic and commerce between them; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

443. Also, petition of Farmers-Manufacturers' Foreign Trade Conference of December 17 and 18, 1923, at Omaha, Nebr., favoring an American merchant marine, without subsidy, as an indispensable link in our transportation system, and recommending a system of lower customs duties on goods carried in American ships; (2) a system of lower rail rates for goods and passengers carried in American ships; (3) a system of lower tonnage dues for American ships; (4) allowing our railroads to apply export rates on materials used in the construction of American ships and on supplies used therein; (5) laws compelling American officials traveling at Government expense to use American ships; (6) laws providing that a certain percentage of our immigrants be carried on American ships; (7) urging American shippers wherever possible to give a fair proportion of their business to American ships; (8) cooperation between the American shipper and the American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

444. Also, petition of Central Union Label Council, of Greater New York, favoring the enactment by Congress of a new reclassification up to \$2,400 per annum with respect to postal workers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

445. Also, petition of City Council of the city of Chicago, that whereas prohibition threatens to become an international problem and involve the United States with foreign countries, and whereas it is and always has been an unpopular piece of legislation in that it is entirely too drastic, it is resolved by the City Council of Chicago to petition Congress to amend the act called the Volstead Act, so that the sale of light wines and beers be permitted as well as the manufacture and transportation thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

446. Also, petition of national convention of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, favoring appropriations for the support of the Army to include sufficient sums to cover the pay and training of at least 33½ per cent of the enrolled Officers' Reserve Corps each year, and all the enlisted Reserve Corps enrolled for the coming year, and to provide adequate material for the instruction of reserve officers at training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

447. Also, petition of the Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, demanding the release of the 15,000 Irish republican prisoners now detained in England's Free State prisons for more than 18 months without trial or charges; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

448. Also, memorial of City Council of the city of Chicago, complimenting Gov. Al. Smith for his fearless act in appending his signature to the enforcement repeal act, and for his courage, patriotism, and love of personal liberty, and resolving further to petition the General Assembly of Illinois to pass an act repealing the search and seizure act of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

449. Also, petition of the Bay Ridge Council of the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, demanding the release of the 15,000 prisoners who have been in prison in the Irish Free State for more than 18 months without trial; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

450. Also, petition of Audubon Community Council and Washington Heights Tenants Association, of New York City, urging an increase in pay for the United States postal clerks and employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

451. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Helena, Calif., protesting against any change in the transportation act at the present time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

452. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Mr. G. G. Good, of Mendota, Ill., favoring repeal of the tax on telephone and telegraph messages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

453. Also, petition of the Crane Medicine Co., of Chicago, Ill., favoring repeal of the war tax on alcohol for manufacturing purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

454. Also, petitions of the Kiwanis Club of Ottawa, Ill., and sundry citizens of Illinois, favoring reclassification and increase of salaries of post-office employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

455. Also, petition of the Abingdon Manufacturing Corporation, of Abingdon, Ill., favoring repeal of subsection 3 of section 900 of the revenue act of 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

456. Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Illinois, favoring the plan of the Secretary of the Treasury for tax reduction, for providing adequately for disabled veterans and for their de-

pendents, but opposing a bonus to those not disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

457. Also, petition of the Morris (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce, opposing any change or amendment of the transportation act of 1920 during the present session of Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

458. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, Louisville, Ky., in re loyalty pledge adopted; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

459. Also, petition of Vieve Louise Smith, R. N., United States Marine Hospital, San Francisco, Calif., in re reclassification bill, and Josephine Vandergon, R. N., United States Marine Hospital, San Francisco, Calif., in re reclassification bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

460. Also, petition of United States Blind Veterans of the World War Convention at St. Louis, requesting immediate compensation for disabled men; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

461. Also, petition of United States Blind Veterans of the World War, St. Louis, Mo., indorsing legislation for the retirement of disabled emergency Army officers, and United States Blind Veterans of the World War, Baltimore, Md., in re misconduct in military service, war-risk insurance, pensioning men disabled after leaving the service, and boycott of rehabilitated wounded ex-service men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

462. Also, petition of Western Forestry and Conservation Association, annual meeting, resolutions requesting appropriations for work in connection with the proper protection of forest areas in Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

463. By Mr. SPEAKS: Papers to accompany House bill 3806, granting a pension to Olive M. Bollinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

464. Also, papers to accompany House bill 3804, granting a pension to Leona Stealey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

465. Also, papers to accompany House bill 3807, granting a pension to Anna O'Neil; to the Committee on Pensions.

466. Also, papers to accompany House bill 3805, granting a pension to Sylvester Condon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

467. Also, papers to accompany House bill 3803, granting a pension to Eliza A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 9, 1924.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, surely Thy abounding goodness ought to call from us increasing gratitude, not simply the gratitude expressed by lips, but evidenced in life. We pray Thee for Thy help to-day, so that whatever may be the duties involved in this day, grant that beginning and ending they may be for Thy glory and the highest welfare of our loved land. We humbly ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (George A. Sanderson) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 9, 1924.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SELDEN P. SPENCER, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair this legislative day.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SPENCER thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

THE JOURNAL.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas suggests the absence of a quorum. The roll will be called.